

be expected to sympathise with the English-speaking people of Lower Canada, it is a crying grievance with the latter that they cannot get such legislation on the subject of education as they desire. What, then, would they have to expect if they went into a Legislature where four-fifths of the representatives were of a different nationality and a different religion, and whose prejudices and interests were in opposition to the claims of the one-fifth minority? (Hear, hear.) Then the Local Legislature is to have control of "the establishment, maintenance and management of hospitals, asylums, charities, and eleemosynary institutions." Now it is a positive fact, as I have stated before, that the English-speaking population of Lower Canada, on account of their wealth and expensive mode of living, their extravagant habits, their desire for change and progress, their different ideas generally from the French-Canadians, consume more than one-half of the dutiable goods that are brought into this country, and pay one-half of the taxes; and yet the money which they would pay into the public chest would be distributed by a majority over whom they had no control—a majority who would not in any manner sympathise with them; and their taxes would be applied to objects which they might not deem desirable—which they might, perhaps, consider detrimental to their interests. And they would be completely without remedy, should this proposed Constitution unfortunately be imposed upon them. (Hear, hear.) It is painful to me to be compelled to refer to these matters. It is not with pleasure that I bring before the House the antagonism which would inevitably arise between the two nationalities, should they be brought together into one Legislature, with such a vast disproportion between their means of taking their own part. We are told, and told very truly—I rejoice that it is the fact—that hitherto the two races in Lower Canada have lived in peace. But it would be impossible that they could any longer live in peace; it would be impossible that with such a disparity of numbers, and with such antagonistic interests they should not come into conflict. It would be a constant warfare, and this new Constitution, instead of settling the sectional difficulties in this country, instead of bringing peace to this country, instead of removing jealousies and heart-burnings, would have the very opposite effect. From the fact that the

field of conflict would be smaller, that the arena would be more circumscribed, the strife would be all the fiercer. You are not bringing peace, but a sword. (Hear, hear.)

MR. POWELL.—Does the leader of the Opposition in Lower Canada assent to that? (Hear, hear.)

MR. O'HALLORAN.—It is not my province to inquire what any hon. gentleman assents to or dissents from. What I have to do is to see that the interests of those who sent me here are not put in jeopardy. And it will be for the leader of the Opposition to see that he too, on his part, faithfully discharges his duty to those he represents. But, sir, the English-speaking people of Lower Canada are to be amused, and their attention is to be diverted from a full examination of those serious matters which press themselves upon our consideration, by cleverly drawn abstractions and sophistries, such as new nationalities—union is strength—a great empire—and the other plausible pretxts that are attempted to be imposed upon them. It would be easy to refute and show how baseless are all these schemes of greatness with which the people of this country are sought to be misled. We are gravely asked: "What man would remain poor, when he could at once become rich? What man would remain weak, when he could at once become powerful? Who would be diminutive, when by merely taking thought he could add cubits to his stature? What people would continue to be a mere colony, when by the stroke of a pen they could at once become an empire, under a new nationality?" Sir, these sophistries will not impose upon the people of this country. Where is the demonstration furnished us that by this scheme you would add one dollar to the wealth of this country, or one human being to its inhabitants, or one inch to its territory? We do not find it afforded during the course of this debate. I have listened attentively to the arguments in favor of the scheme, but no attempt has been made to demonstrate these things. It has been repeatedly stated that we are about to consolidate the strength of this country, in order to resist invasion; but I should like to know in what manner such an end is promoted by this measure. Are we not already united under one Government? Are we not already living under the control of the same executive power? Do we not fight under the same flag, and pay allegiance to