

so rapidly as it is proposed to do, because it is extremely difficult to foresee what will be the bearing of the platform which it is proposed to erect. I have just cited the rights which Confederation would confer upon the Federal Government in respect of certain points; but there are other interests which may perhaps be imperilled by this measure—I will cite, for instance, the rights of the creditors of the provinces.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—They will have the guarantee of the Confederation.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—The rights of the creditors of the province will form the subject of an arrangement between Upper and Lower Canada at a later period, but the creditors will have the guarantee of the whole Confederation.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—I see nothing of that in the resolutions.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—All the details are not included in the resolutions; but as to the balance of \$5,000,000 which will have to be divided between Upper and Lower Canada, and which constitutes the difference between the \$62,000,000 of debt which will be assumed by the Confederation, and the \$67,000,000 which Canada owes, a division will be made before Parliament is dissolved.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—I understood that the debts were to be divided and that the indemnity to the seigniors, for instance, for the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure was to be imposed entirely on Lower Canada. If there are any verbal explanations beyond what is contained in the resolutions, I am quite willing to receive them from the Government, but that is just the reason why we should not be in a hurry to adopt these resolutions until we have those explanations, for it might be dangerous not to have all these questions settled before voting for Confederation; who can say whether we can settle them as well after as before? These promises of explanations shew that, since all the facts are not submitted, we may easily mistake the meaning of the resolutions which we are called upon to adopt. In any case, I certainly see nothing in these resolutions which gives the seigniors the guarantee of the Confederation as security for their claim, and I can only judge of the resolutions by what they contain, especially in the absence of any explanation of the details. The Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. GALT) stated that the debt due to the seigniors would fall on Lower Canada alone, and this does not agree exactly with what the Prime Minister has just said. As I said a short time

ago, when speaking of the school question, I would not vote for a Constitution which would not confer on the Catholics of Upper Canada the same advantages as are possessed by the Protestants of Lower Canada, and I consider that this is a matter that should be settled before taking a vote on the resolutions, for when Confederation is once voted it may easily happen that we shall not be able to obtain what is promised us now. We therefore are in a position which may make us sacrifice the minority of Upper Canada by voting Confederation now, or make us vote against a principle which we might perhaps accept, if we were acquainted with all its details. For my part, I acknowledge that I would not cause the plan of Confederation which is proposed to us to miscarry, if it is possible to make it just, acceptable and useful to all parties. But for this I will not sacrifice the interests of a portion of the population. Another point upon which we require explanations, and respecting which we have none, is that relating to the constitution of the local governments. Now, for instance, some journals which usually express the views and opinions of the present Government, have stated that in all the local governments the system of responsibility of the ministers to the people or their representatives would not exist, but that an irresponsible system would be substituted for it. I ask which of you would accept such a system, and what part of the people would approve of such an alteration in our political institutions? You are told "vote for the plan submitted to you, and the details will be explained to you at a later period." But at a later period neither Upper nor Lower Canada will be master of the position, and able to obtain the system of government which may suit them, should that imposed upon them not meet their views. But, yet once more, why hurry you so much? Why, for instance, should this House be called upon to sit twice a-day on this question before even its details are known? Why depart from our custom of examining matters in a calm and deliberate manner. Certainly, up to the present time, not one valid reason has been given to justify the hurry in which it is proposed to carry this measure. Mention has indeed been made of defence, but this is no valid reason, for it is perfectly well known that all the resources of Canada are now at the disposal of England in case of need; this precipitate action is then neither justified nor justifiable. I ask whether we know the plan of Confederation which is submitted to us,