

ments for the future, to lay aside all unnecessary delicacy, and by our action to lay down the guarantees for the perpetuation of these kind feelings and this spirit of toleration so long existing, and which he devoutly hoped would never cease. No greater calamity could befall the English, or, in fact, both races, than the introduction of religious discord among the people of Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) It would, however, be a grievous mistake to overlook the safeguards and rules necessary to perpetuate kindly feelings, and to prevent the disposition to aggressions which existed more or less in all minds. That principle—the love of power—was found in every human heart, none were exempt from it, and the history of the world showed that no people had ever risen superior to it. The Honorable Premier had recognised this truth in the remarks he had made in regard of the difficulties between Upper and Lower Canada. The French Canadians had persistently refused the demands of Upper Canada for representation by population, because of the terror they felt that, if granted, their institutions would be in danger; and he had told the French members in the House that under the new Constitution their rights were so effectually guarded that their autonomy was fully secured—the safeguards thereof being put in their own hands. But, at the same time, the English, who were a fourth of the population, and who, by habit and tradition, had their own views of public policy, were left entirely without guarantee other than the good feelings and tolerant spirit of the French. Was this safe? The only safeguard they were to have was in regard of education, but in regard of the rights of property they were to be left to the Legislature. And this brought him to the consideration of that part of the proposed Constitution which had reference to civil rights and rights of property. It was said that the civil laws of Lower Canada were now consolidated into a code, and this would enhance our credit; and if based upon sound principles and rendered permanent, it would undoubtedly do so, for what is so conducive to the prosperity of a country as well-protected rights of property and vested interests? This feature was deeply engrained in the British mind, and in that of the United States also, inasmuch that the American Constitution provides that no law could be passed which would affect the rights of property. This was exemplified in the celebrated Dartmouth College case, in which WEBSTER so distinguished himself, when the endowment was maintained and perpetuated. But

to what power were the rights of property committed in these resolutions? When the Minister of Finance appealed to moneyed men abroad for a loan, could he say the Constitution had provided guarantees against injurious changes, when it was known that the laws relating to property were left to the caprice of the local governments? Where was the security of the great religious societies of Montreal, if a sentiment hostile to monopolies were carried to extremes in the Local Parliament?

HON. SIR. E. P. TACHÉ—The General Legislature had power to disallow such acts.

HON. MR. CURRIE—This would be an interference with local rights.

HON. MR. ROSS—It would preserve local rights.

HON. MR. SANBORN—It was a wise power and commended itself to all; it was, however, not an ordinary power to be commonly resorted to, but an extreme power, and one almost revolutionary. It was a power somewhat similar to that which existed in the second branch of the Legislature to stop the supplies, but in its very nature not one often to be exercised; and it could not be frequently exercised without destroying the very foundations of society, and occasioning evils of the greatest magnitude. On the whole he conceived that entrusting such power to the local governments was illogical and dangerous, and informing the world that the rights of property were not made sure. It was urged by some that, to make the measure now before the House answer the ends proposed, it must be immediately adopted, but he did not participate in this opinion. He knew no reason for this haste, and could not believe that a few months would make any material difference. This union, when formed, was to strengthen us so marvellously that we would be able to intimidate all the rest of the world, and guarantee us a lasting peace with all mankind. It might increase facilities for communication, but could not increase our real strength. How the people of New Brunswick could be expected to come up to Canada to defend us, and leave their own frontier unprotected, he could not comprehend. If he had misinterpreted the statements or explanations on this point, let the ministers show how this greater strength was to be acquired. There would be three or four provinces more united together, but the frontier to be defended would be increased in greater proportion than the additional number of men acquired. It was said by the advocates of the scheme that the naval power of