

with reference to the elective principle, I desire now to speak about one or two other things in connection with these resolutions. And one thing in particular, I find, has not been spoken of by any member on the floor of this House. I refer now to the sixth clause, with reference to education. Now, hon. gentlemen, it strikes me it was decidedly wrong on the part of the delegates to place anything in reference to the education of the people of Upper and Lower Canada in this scheme. I will give my reasons for it, and I think those reasons are good. I think it should be left fully and entirely to the people of Upper and Lower Canada to decide what is best with reference to this matter. We see already that both in Upper and Lower Canada both parties are actively engaged endeavoring to press upon the attention of both Houses of Parliament the necessity of granting them greater privileges than they already enjoy. They seem to be determined to have nothing less for their Catholic education than a full staff of officers, together with model and normal schools, and all the paraphernalia which attach to the present common school system. That which in Upper Canada was regarded as a finality in school matters is now scouted at, and the advocates of separate schools go so far as to insist upon having a college; and the object is no doubt to place themselves in a position to be wholly independent of the proposed local government of Upper Canada. So far as I am individually concerned in reference to schools, I would far rather that the school system was worked out in both provinces on the principle of the common schools. I see no reason why in any neighborhood a portion of the children should be sent to one description of school, and a portion of the children sent to another description of school. I believe it is wrong in principle, and that the children of our common country should grow up together and be educated together. In our public schools there should be nothing taught which would have the effect of preventing any person from sending their children to them. These are my views in reference to schools. I believe that the effect of giving exclusive rights and privileges to certain parties has had a tendency to weaken the good feeling which should subsist between all classes of the community, and which is now seen in the demand from both sections for different systems of education. (Hear, hear.) The next thing to which I desire to call the attention of the

House is that of the Intercolonial Railway. I am opposed *in toto* to that great road. I am opposed to it for the best of all reasons. In the first place, I am not satisfied with it, because I do not know what it is going to cost. There is nothing in these resolutions to indicate what is to be the expense; nor have I been able to discover from what has taken place on the floor of the House, any *data* on the subject. Consequently, I do not feel that it would be my duty to vote for a measure which is going to entail upon Upper Canada a large amount of debt, without first knowing what that debt is to be. So far from this being regarded as a commercial undertaking, I cannot for the life of me see how it is possible that it can be worked commercially. The hon. member from Montreal (Hon. Mr. FERBIER), who spoke in his place the other evening, never touched upon this subject. All he told us in reference to this great scheme was simply this: that there were 100 odd cars lying at Montreal laden with produce, and that they could not go forward because on the other side of the lines they had so much to do that they could not send the cars through. But this was no argument at all in favor of the Intercolonial Railway. But supposing the road were built, do hon. gentlemen believe for a moment that it would pay running expenses? There is no doubt in my mind that to keep it open a subsidy would be required, like that which is paid to the ocean steamers. It was stated the other day by the hon. member from Montreal that two cents per ton per mile was a very small rate for railway carriage. But taking it at that figure, what do we find? From Toronto to the seaboard, over the Intercolonial Railway, the distance may be estimated at 939 miles, and to send a barrel of flour that distance by railway, at a cost of two cents per mile per ton, the charges on the flour would be not less than \$2.08. But supposing one-half this tariff were charged—one cent per ton per mile—and we are told that at such a rate the road would be run at a loss, the cost would be \$1.04; and by the time the barrel of flour was laid down in Liverpool, there would be charges on it for carriage of eight or ten cents per each bushel of wheat over what was formerly paid. These figures are based on the authority of hon. gentlemen opposite. "Oh! but," say they, "the farmer gets the benefit of his money during the winter." I do not see that this is any argument at all in a commercial point of