

ground which she had conquered in her struggles of former days. I do not believe that there is a single member for Lower Canada who would wish to change our present Constitution in the manner now proposed, were he not forced to it by Upper Canada. We are, then, about to give up some of our franchises and our rights in this new struggle against the spirit of encroachment and domination manifested by the English race. Hon. members who support the measure will tell you that they are giving up a part of our rights, in order that what remains may be saved from destruction, and that they may not lose all they now enjoy, before any lengthened period shall have elapsed. But was this clamor in favor of representation based upon population sincere on the part of those who used it as a means of attacking us? Was it in reality a remedy for the evils of which they complained? No, Mr. SPEAKER, I do not think it was. It was simply an electoral platform, by which to attain power and consummate the encroachment upon our rights contemplated by the leaders of the movement. I do not deem it necessary to repeat here all the arguments brought to bear against the demand for representation by population, in eighty speeches delivered in 1860, during the discussion of that exciting question; but I remember that debate with all the more pleasure, that the French-Canadians shewed that they retained some vestiges of firmness in the day of battle, and of perseverance in the maintenance of our rights, which our fathers had so often manifested. On that occasion the Hon. Attorney General East (Hon. Mr. CARTIER) deserved the approbation of his country for the resistance he made to that unjust demand on the part of Upper Canada, with that energy and tenacity he is so well known to display; he was the champion of our rights. Why, then, does he to-day come down and propose a compromise with his opponents of those days? Is it just at the moment when the leaders of the Upper Canadian Opposition had, by entering the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government, absolutely rejected the principle of representation based upon population, that he should abandon the struggle? Is it at the moment the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government had obtained separate schools for the Catholics of Upper Canada, that the party led by the honorable member for South Oxford was to be dreaded? Is it at the moment when the law providing separate

schools for the Catholics of Upper Canada was the subject of a triumph, which the Hon. Attorney General had never succeeded in obtaining during the whole time he has been in power, that the Hon. Attorney General should cease from further efforts, throw down his arms, and declare as a French-Canadian that we could no longer hold the breach, and that we must make concessions to Upper Canada? Did not the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Administration make a close question of representation by population? Were not all the members of that Government bound to oppose it? Yes, Mr. SPEAKER, the Hon. Attorney-General East was guilty of a grievous wrong, when he defeated that Government by a hostile majority composed of French-Canadians. It was after that hostile vote that Upper Canada insisted on her right to renew her claims to representation based on population, and that we are compelled to-day to make concessions. For my part, Mr. SPEAKER, I have never been convinced of the sincerity of those who made use of the cry for representation based on population, for I have never seen any other means employed to obtain the aid of the western farmers in securing more easily the reins of power. Has the principle of representation based on population ever served as the basis of a government having monarchical ideas, like those which actuate the existing Government? Now we are seeking for a Confederation for which there is no precedent—not a Confederation like those to be found in other countries which have adopted that form of government, but a monarchical Confederation. (Hear, hear.) It is sought to retain the English Constitution, and yet it is asserted that representation by population is a just principle, and that it must be extended to Upper Canada. Does not the Honorable Attorney General East (Hon. Mr. CARTIER) remember the arguments he urged in 1860 against this principle? Did he not then declare with the view of showing that the principle was neither a just one nor one recognized in the British Constitution, that if it were applied to the British Parliament the city of London alone would have thirty members instead of sixteen, and that Scotland would send many more members to Parliament than she does now? Did he not assert that rotten boroughs, containing only a few hundred inhabitants, had one representative, and that counties containing 100,000 inhabitants had no more? Have these argu-