

MR. J. B. E. DORION—This is the sort of justice to be expected from the other side of the House.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—You may speak when you like; you can speak when your turn comes, but we shall not listen to you.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—I assert then that the hon. member for Lotbinière has appealed to the passions, seeking to have it believed on the one hand that French Canadian nationality and the Catholic religion would be endangered by Confederation, and on the other hand that English nationality and the Protestant religion would be exposed to danger in Lower Canada under the local government. He cited in the English language the report of Lord DURHAM, to induce the belief that the English of Lower Canada would never consent to submit to a legislature, the majority of which would be French-Canadian; but for my part I am not of that opinion, and I think that they will submit to it, because they are sure that they will be treated with justice. It ill became that hon. gentleman to make this statement, when he is himself elected for a county exclusively Catholic, which has not hesitated to entrust him with its interests. He ought not to have made this appeal, as he himself is a living proof of the religious tolerance and liberality of our compatriots. Neither did it become the hon. member for Hochelaga to speak as he did to the same effect, when we have seen a large and important electoral division—the division of Laurentides—reject a venerable gentleman who presented himself for reelection to the Legislative Council, a man who had been in political life for more than twenty-five years, to elect in his place an English Protestant, Mr. PRICE, although there were not 1,500 Protestants in the whole division, out of a population of 50,000 souls. The election of the member for the county of Megantic (Mr. IRVINE) is yet another evidence of the liberality of our fellow-countrymen, the majority of the residents in that county being French-Canadians and Catholics.

MR. J. B. E. DORION—It was not they who sent him here.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—On the contrary, but for their votes he would not have been returned to Parliament for that county. I may further say, Mr. SPEAKER, that the presence here of the hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON), that

of the member for Chateauguy (Hon. Mr. HOLTON), and the presence of several other members afford abundant proof of the liberality of our fellow-countrymen, because those honorable members, although English and Protestant, represent counties the great majority of the population in each of which is French-Canadian and Catholic. The English have always been dealt with more liberally than the hon. member for Hochelaga himself would, perhaps, treat us were he in power. We did not require the aid of the hon. members for Hochelaga and Lotbinière for the protection of the minorities in the Conference. We were the first to demand that justice should be extended to the Catholics of Upper Canada and the Protestants of Lower Canada, because we desired to establish a solid work, and not to build on the sand an edifice which would crumble to dust the next day. The English of Lower Canada will not be excited by the appeals of the hon. members, because they know that whatever they can justly claim will be conceded to them without difficulty and with all good will. Mr. SPEAKER, although it is with great regret that I have to ask the continued attention of the House, at this late period of the evening, yet such is the great importance of the question before us, that I venture to hope that the House will pardon me for presenting at such length my views on this matter. I may be permitted, I hope, to refute another assertion made by the honorable member for Hochelaga. That honorable member, who has found something to censure in every article of the scheme of Confederation, conceived that he produced an argument that would be irresistible by asserting that the distribution of the debt was unfair and burdensome to Lower Canada. To give a greater force to this argument, he stated that Lower Canada entered into the union with a debt of \$400,000, and that she would leave it with a burden of \$30,000,000, after having only expended in the interval the sum of \$12,000,000 for public works within her limits. This argument is most specious. Supposing that our debt was \$400,000, and that to-day it is \$30,000,000, the honorable member must at all events admit that the circumstances also have very much changed. At the time of the union our population was only 630,000, and to-day it is 1,250,000. The honorable member, too, must not forget that at the time of the union our territory only produced 21,000,000