

a Government cannot always execute the law as logically as the hon. member desires."—(Vide Senate Debates 1880-81, page 37).

It is proper to remark that this state of things has lasted for eight years, and has already reached the stage of a precedent. Every year we have pressed upon Sir John Macdonald to repair this infringement upon our rights, but he has not acceded to our request. This violation of the constitution has already borne its fruit. We have to-day the sad spectacle of our three French Ministers invoking, as an excuse for their grievous offence—their adherence to the execution of Riel—"if we should resign on that question Sir John would replace us by three English members." That is to say, in other words, "Sir John could do in the Commons that which he has done in the Senate with our approbation; he could deprive us of the constitutional right of having French ministers. It was therefore better to sacrifice Riel and to keep our portfolios." Will the French-Canadian people accept that excuse? And the English-speaking population generally, so attached to the charter of their liberties, will they have nothing to say when they see the constitution trampled under foot? To-day it is we who suffer; to-morrow it may be their turn.

In 1881 a French member of Parliament desiring to ascertain how each nationality fared in the distribution of the public patronage, called for a return showing the number of public employes in the Dominion, their salaries, their nationality, religion, etc. The Government, through the Minister of Justice, grossly refused to comply with that request. Other Conservative members replied sharply and placed the government in such a false position that the motion passed. A year passed by but the report was not submitted. At the end of eighteen months there was still no sign of the return which had been asked for. At length after two years of waiting and interrogations, the Minister of Justice presented the return and said that it showed that the French-Canadians had received more than their share of the public patronage. Nobody dared to contradict that statement without an opportunity to make a close examination of the return, which had been prepared in a manner which

necessitated a great deal of labor to arrive at a conclusion. However, it was found that the Minister who had brought down the report had deceived the Chamber, that the French Canadians had not received their share of the public patronage, that instead of holding one-third of the official positions, to which their numerical strength gave them a right, they had only one-sixth, that is to say, about one-half of what they were entitled to. The same remark applies to the amount of salaries which they received; they have but one-sixth. The total population of the Dominion at the last census was 4,421,810. The French race numbered 1,298,929 souls. We French Canadians have then a right to at least 22 French Senators of the 77 members who compose the Senate, whereas we have but 19. Let us now take the Province of Quebec alone. It has a population of all origins of 1,359,027 souls, and of these the French number 1,073,020, which would give it a right to 19 senators of our nationality, whereas we have but 17. The Speakers of the two Houses of Parliament speak no language but English. (See Senate Debates of 1884, page 113.) Shall I speak to you of the law passed at the last session of the Dominion Parliament—a law based on the radical and revolutionary principle of universal suffrage, and which has, moreover, the rate merit of excluding the educated farmer from the position of reviser—a position which he is more competent to fill than professional men generally are. (See chap. 40, section 14, of the Statutes of 1885.) Shall I mention the License Act, by means of which Sir John hoped to break up the Confederation and to bring about a legislative union, his dream for years? No. I have said enough to open the eyes of those who wish to study the question in good faith, of those who will not allow themselves to be blinded by party spirit or by other motives still less defensible. I have said enough to satisfy those who sincerely desire to clearly understand this important question of our rights and our privileges.

We now come to the scaffold of Regina of the 16th of November last. "The Province of Quebec was drifting rapidly to the brink of ruin," says *L'Impartial*. "God has allowed the melancholy