

1858—an Administration which had no very long existence. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—Unfortunately. (Laughter.)

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—That Administration had no very long existence, and I rejoice that I did my part in upsetting it, for it is probable that, if it had stood, representation based on population would have been forced upon us, and we should not be now in our present position—in a position to make our own terms as freely as Upper Canada, and take part, on a footing of equality, in negotiating a treaty with the Lower Provinces. This is why I rejoice that I contributed to overthrow that government. The hon. member for Hochelaga told us the other evening that in 1856 he spoke as follows :—

In 1856, when Parliament was sitting at Toronto, I first suggested that one means of surmounting our difficulties would be the substitution of a Confederation of the two Canadas in place of a Legislative union. By that arrangement local questions would be debated in the local legislatures, and the Central Government would have the control of commercial and other questions of general interest. I said that considering the differences of race, religion and laws now existing between the two sections of the country, it would be the best means of surmounting them. That is to say, I would leave to a central government questions regarding commerce, banking, the currency, public works of a general character, &c., and to the local legislatures all local questions. At the same time I said that if these views were not accepted, I should certainly be in favor of representation based on population, with conditions and guarantees which would secure the interests of Lower Canada, and preserve to Lower Canada the institutions which are so dear to her.

Well, we see that in 1856, the hon. member for Hochelaga was desirous of forming a new Constitution for the express purpose of stifling the cry for representation based on population. In 1858 he formed, together with the present Hon. President of the Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN), the BROWN-DORION Government; and again, he stipulated that the question of representation based on population should be taken into consideration, and that the Government should consider the means of settling the difficulties which it involved. In 1859 he signed a document, which also bore the signatures of Hon. Mr. DRUMMOND, Hon. Mr. DESSAULLES, and Hon. Mr. MCGEE, in which he said with his colleagues, that a change in

the Constitution of the country was necessary :—

If Lower Canada insists on maintaining the union intact; if she will neither consent to a dissolution of the union, nor consider the project of a Federation, it is difficult to conceive on what reasonable grounds the demand for representation according to population can be resisted. The plea for such resistance has hitherto been that danger might arise to some of her peculiar and most cherished institutions; but that ground will be no longer tenable if she rejects a proposition, the effect of which would be to leave to her own people the sole and absolute custody of those institutions, and to surround them by the most stringent of all possible safeguards, the provisions of the fundamental law of the land, unalterable save by the action of the people affected by them. The logical alternative now presented to the people of Lower Canada would, therefore, seem to be dissolution or federation on the one hand, and representation according to population on the other.

Here, again, he intended to stifle the cry of representation based on population, and intended to do it by founding a new Confederation. In 1861 it was just the same; he declared that he was desirous of settling that question of the representation; that it was not expedient that it should remain an open question; that it was a difficulty to be got rid of one way or another. In 1862, also, he went into the Government with the same object in view. But how did he set about carrying it out? He made it a close question, and adopted, with his colleagues, the plan of the double majority. The hon. member doubtless had forgotten that in 1859, when he penned the manifesto which I have just quoted, he had condemned the double majority. Here is, in fact, what he said in that document :—

In each section there would still be minority and majority parties, and unless the principle of the double majority could be enacted as a fundamental law, we should be exposed to an endless round of the same complaints that we now hear, of one section ruling the other contrary to its well known public opinion, and to see reproduced in our politics the same passions, the same intrigues, the same corruption and insincerity. The enactment of the double majority is not advocated in any quarter. The impossibility of clearly defining the cases to which it should apply, and of distinguishing them from those to which it should not, is felt by all; but were it even possible, it would only lead to new phases of difficulty, by compelling majorities professing opinions and principles diametrically opposed to each other, to unite, and thereby effectually to extinguish the influence