

minority of Upper Canada must not be abandoned to the mercy of the majority, and we succeeded in obtaining for them a system of separate schools which, however, does not appear to satisfy the minority. In Lower Canada the Protestant minority has always been satisfied with the school system, until quite lately; and they have now begun to agitate with the view of obtaining, as they pretend, a more equitable distribution of the moneys appropriated for school purposes. For my part, I know that they have no foundation for their claim, and I remember that when I was Secretary of the province, I drew the attention of the Superintendent of Education to the unequal distribution of the money, as it appeared that the Protestant minority of Lower Canada received a larger amount than they were entitled to. He replied that the distribution had been so made by his predecessor, and that he had not deemed it advisable to make any change. Thus we see that uneasiness prevails among the minority, both in Upper Canada and Lower Canada, and even among the majority in Lower Canada. But I was astonished to hear the remedy announced by my honorable colleague (Hon. Sir N. F. BELLEAU), in the event of the Federal Government endeavoring to prejudice the interests of Lower Canada. He tells us that as Lower Canada is to have sixty-five representatives in the Federal Legislature out of 194, these sixty-five members from Lower Canada will always be able to preserve their rights by taking sides with the Opposition to turn out the Government. Does the hon. member really suppose that all the members from Lower Canada would make common cause on any question? Does he not know that there will always be a minority among them of different origin and religion who will probably take part with the Government or with the majority? In such a case, what would the Opposition from Lower Canada avail about which he talks? Do we not know that the difficulties which gave rise to the plan of Confederation were produced by the coalition of an Upper Canada minority with the Lower Canada majority? And what happened to Upper Canada might very well happen to Lower Canada. By rejecting the principle of the double majority adopted by a liberal ministry, the apple of discord was thrown among the legislative body which originated the present difficulties. Another great error committed by the members from

Lower Canada was the overturning of a government which had maintained the principle of an equality in representation. We now see to what that has brought us. The hon. member (Hon. Sir N. F. BELLEAU) had said that our institutions would be protected under the Federal Government. But how? By the resolutions as they stand they would not be so guarded; and would not the General Government put its veto on every act of the local governments? And while on this subject, I should like to know what is to be the organization of the Local Government of Lower Canada. As far as I can see, it is this—that nearly all our local revenue is to be taken from us, and we are to be allowed a subsidy of eighty cents per head. And yet this is not all. There will be a debt of \$5,000,000 to be shared between Upper and Lower Canada; and how is this sharing to be brought about? If, as we are told, Lower Canada is to be charged with the payment of the debt contracted for the redemption of the Seigniorial Tenure, that alone will represent a capital of about \$4,118,202, including \$891,500 indemnity to the townships. Is Lower Canada to undertake the payment of that sum? Certain sources of revenue in Lower Canada are devoted to the redemption of the Seigniorial Tenure, but if the Federal Government absorbs these sources of revenue, who will assure us that the Local Government will not repudiate the Seigniorial debt now by the Federal scheme sought to be imposed on it? The Local Legislature will say, perhaps, that the Imperial Government has not the right of annulling the act which imposes on United Canada the payment of the indemnity to the seigniors, and will probably refuse to assume the whole responsibility of it, alleging that the General Government ought to pay it. And if the Local Government takes this course, what will the General Government do? On this question it will be easy to excite the passions of the people, prejudiced as they already are against the seigniors. Chiefly, and above all, we are bound to respect vested rights. We are recommended to vote with blind confidence, but we are refused the details, which might satisfy the country and the honorable members of this House. Why not lay the constitution of the Local Government before the House? We are told that the possession of her civil code is to be guaranteed to Lower Canada, but we are not informed how it is to be done.