

HON. MR. FERGUSON BLAIR assented.

HON. MR. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said, that if he were sufficiently master of English he would address the House in that language, but not being so would have to use the French. The difficulties to which allusion had been made were produced by two causes. They were not constitutional, however, but parliamentary, and, as he believed, could have been surmounted without recourse to the constitutional change which it was proposed to adopt without appeal to the country. It was true that difficulties had succeeded to difficulties, and that legislation was stopped, but if the leaders had sought in the Legislature itself for the means of removing them, he believed they would have been found. Who would guarantee the Government under the new Constitution from the recurrence of similar troubles? There would of course be an Opposition as in the smaller House. If similar difficulties happened, would the Confederation seek relief in another change of Constitution. On the contrary, would not relief be sought in the means he had suggested. At any rate he did not think such a change as the union of all the British provinces was required. In 1820, when a union of Upper and Lower Canada was proposed, it was objected that if it did not work a larger union would follow, and then, lastly, a legislative union of all the provinces. Two of these steps had already been taken, and we were going on with rapid strides towards the last. In such a case it was not hard to conceive what would be the position of Lower Canada. It was a misfortune that we had to contend with national prejudices, but it was impossible to forget them. In the event of a legislative union would the guarantees proposed to Lower Canada under the federation system be found? Would it not then be at the mercy of those they now feared? He admitted we had a rich country as represented; we had wheat fields, mineral resources, forests, rivers and lakes, but to make them available did we require an increase of territory? We had territory enough, and an increase would be a source of weakness, not of strength. Would it not add to our already large frontier, and make us more vulnerable to invasions. The union would not increase the power of England to protect us, and England would have the same interest in protecting the colonies without as well as with the union. New Brunswick might be rich in coal, in wood and in fisheries, and do a large business in ship building, but these things would seek the best markets under any circum-

stances, and he did not see that a union with us would increase their value, and if it did it would be no advantage. Then, as to Nova Scotia with its small population and fine harbour—where would be the advantage of connection with her? Though not united, would not the harbour be equally available to our vessels? He would now say he preferred to Confederation a legislative union of Upper and Lower Canada with inequality of representation in the Lower House and equality in the Upper. This would not add to the expenses of the province, and would be more consonant with our interests and the sentiments [ideas] of the people. Though there should be inequality in the Assembly, the equality in the Legislative Council would act as a counterpoise, and prevent one section from invading the interests of the other. Then did not Confederation consecrate [establish] the principle of representation according to population? It would give larger to one of the nationalities, and, as the General Government would be able to veto the acts of the Local Government, would there be no danger to Lower Canada? If representation by population had been so much opposed in this part, it was doubtless because there was cause of fear, yet this very power was to be conferred upon the Federal Government. If it could not be given with safety under our present regime, how could it be safer to give it to the Confederation. The advantage of the plan to Upper Canada was well understood, for immediately after the coalition they all agreed to say they had gained what they had so long contended for.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—Well, after all, they only got what the honorable member himself proposed to give them.

HON. MR. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said he always preferred a short direct course to a long tortuous one. The friends of the new movement had tried to conceal the fact that representation according to population was to be conceded to Upper Canada, but they had failed, and the avowal had come out at last. The resolutions not being before the House, it would be improper to go into the merits of the details, but he could not avoid alluding to one point which was of profound interest. It was clear that the constituencies had not sent honorable members to this House for the purpose of electing themselves members for life, as they were invited to do. They were not sent here to change the Constitution, but to uphold it. (Hear.) You were, in fact, about to declare that the local governments would have power to recommend to the