

cause the elective qualification of the Belgian senators is higher than that of our legislative councillors. The Belgian Senate is elected for eight years, and is renewed by one-fourth at a time.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—Every four years, by one-half.

HON. MR. DORION—Yes; the honorable member is right. The term for which each senator is elected is eight years, and the elections take place for one-half of them every four years, and another change in the composition of the Senate can also take place, because it may be dissolved like the Lower House. Now, under these circumstances, there can be no clashing of any duration between the two Belgian Chambers, and the Senate cannot obstruct, for an indefinite period, the action of the Lower House. If a difference should arise between the two bodies, the Government can remedy it by new elections, by which senators would be returned favorable to the views of the people. Thus the Senate is not conservative, from the sole fact of the electoral qualification of the senators being very high. What I consider excessive and of a too conservative character in the constitution of the Legislative Council of the Confederation, is that no power exists which can change its composition in the case of a collision between it and the House of Commons. The councillors will be appointed for life, and their number is fixed. By what means shall we be able to prevent the Legislative Council from stopping the progress of business if a difference should arise with the Lower House? The honorable member for Montmorency says that the obstacle will be broken down; but if no other remedy than that is provided, I say that the principle is faulty. It does not do, when we frame a Constitution, to open the door to obstacles which can only be surmounted by breaking them down. (Hear, hear.) In England, where the House of Lords is very conservative, the Crown has power to name new peers, and it is precisely the possession of that power of creating new peers which has prevented the breaking down of the obstacle—which prevented a revolution in 1832. The honorable member for Montmorency himself admits that at that period England was on the eve of a revolution, and that it would have happened if the House had any longer refused to sanction the measures of reform passed by the House of Commons and demanded by the people; and that revolution was only avoided because the King, having

declared that he would create new peers, a certain number of the lords, to escape this danger, absented themselves and permitted the passing of the Parliamentary Reform Bill. (Hear, hear.) There are two or three other matters which are left to the joint jurisdiction of the Federal and Local Legislatures, such as agriculture, emigration, and the fisheries; but the laws of the Federal Parliament will always prevail in these matters over those of the local parliaments; thus, for instance, a Local Legislature may pass a law in relation to agriculture, but it may be overridden the next day by a law of the Federal Legislature. (Hear, hear.) I shall not touch upon the question of the finances, but I must say that the figures given by the Hon. Solicitor General East do not agree with those in the Public Accounts. I do not know where he obtained them, but for my part I have been unable to find them. When I enquired whether Lower Canada was to pay the Municipal Loan Fund debt, he did not think proper to answer. When I asked the Hon. Minister of Finance whether Lower Canada would be charged with the debt contracted for the redemption of the Seigniorial dues, with the Common School Fund, the Municipal Loan Fund, and the indemnity payable to the townships, amounting in the whole to \$4,500,000, he replied that he would bring down a proposition at some future period for the settlement of these questions, but he has not thought proper to give any explanations. Well, I have stated that besides the debt of \$67,000,000 due by the province, there are more than \$3,000,000 due to Upper Canada as compensation for the Seigniorial indemnity, and that in fixing at \$62,500,000 the debt to be assumed by the Federal Government, there will remain about \$9,000,000 to divide between Upper and Lower Canada. With the amount of the Municipal Loan Fund debt and of the other items which I have mentioned, Lower Canada will find herself charged with a local debt of \$4,500,000. (Hear, hear.) When we entered the union we had a debt of \$500,000; we have expended since the union, on public works in Lower Canada, about \$13,000,000, and we go out of the union with a debt of \$27,500,000 as our proportion of the Federal debt, besides our own special debt of \$4,500,000, whilst Upper Canada will go out of it without any local debt on giving up the indemnity to which she is entitled under the Seigniorial Act of 1859. Well, I assert that it is an unjust