

through such action, than the Lower Provinces. Therefore it seems to me more reasonable to suppose that the American sympathizers in New Brunswick have been defeated at the polls, instead of triumphant. The Hon. President of the Council explains the difference between Canada and New Brunswick, as to the desirability of having new elections, by saying that there was a new election there because the term of the Legislature was about to expire. Well, this would have been our last session too, if the Confederation scheme had passed, and therefore supposing the Confederation scheme to have gone into operation as soon as the Government anticipated it would, we should have been exactly in the same position as New Brunswick in relation to a new election. The same reasons for having a new election there exist here, and there is no better reason to be assigned for refusing to allow the people of Canada to express themselves on this project, than there was for the Government of New Brunswick to refuse a dissolution of the Legislature of that province. But while we see the Government of that province willing and anxious to give the people an opportunity of expressing their will, how differently are the people of Canada treated! (Hear, hear.) The Hon. President of the Council has alluded to a majority of the French-Canadians being in favor of the Confederation scheme. I find by the vote that twenty-six voted in favor of it, and twenty-two against. Among the twenty-six were three members of the Administration who propounded the scheme, and were so interested in the result of the vote, that in all fairness they ought not to be counted. Deducting these, the figures would stand twenty-three to twenty-two.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Well, if you deduct the members of the Government, you ought also to deduct the leaders of the Opposition. (Laughter.)

MR. JOLY—I think not, because they were not more deeply interested in the vote than other members on the floor of the House. Out of the twenty-six, there are at least half a dozen whose conduct has been condemned in the most direct manner by their constituents, in public assemblies duly held for the purpose of considering the Confederation question. I can instance the counties of Joliette, Rouville, Chambly, L'Assomption, &c. So if we take the French-Canadians and place the matter in a fair and equitable footing, we will find that they are about equally divided in this House, and that it is hard to tell whether the

majority of the people are for or against it by their representatives in Parliament. It is impossible to know what the opinions of the French-Canadians are at this moment, or to find out, except by giving them an opportunity to record their votes by means of the elections. The French-Canadians are nearly a million of people, and I think they are entitled to be heard on this scheme as much as any of the Lower Provinces; and if for no other purpose than to give them an opportunity of expressing themselves, there ought to be a general election. I say that we have been taken by surprise through the rapid manner in which this scheme has been introduced and carried through this House. We have been told that because our leaders would not agree to any arrangement by which the demands of Upper Canada could be met, either in whole or in part, the scheme has been imposed upon us. If that alternative had been presented to us at an earlier day, I think it would have been possible for us to have met our Upper Canadian friends in a scheme of conciliation, agreeing upon a measure which, if not satisfactory to all, would, at all events, draw us more closely to one another. For instance, the principal complaint is that Upper Canada pays two-thirds of the taxes, and is allowed to have control of only one-half the money contributed by those taxes. I will not say that I would grant representation by population rather than be forced to accept the Confederation scheme; but I can say that I find the claim of Upper Canada, in reference to the finances, perfectly fair and just, and I only rise to express my opinion, as one of the members of this House, to that effect. I would be quite willing to enter into some arrangement that would give to Upper Canada a greater proportion of the expenditure, in proportion to its population, and stake my chances of re-election upon that declaration. (Hear, hear.) I dare say that many in Upper Canada would not be quite satisfied with that; but for my part, I do not feel that I have a right to offer more. I merely wish to show that Lower Canadians are not so lost to all sense of justice as not to recognise the correctness of that principle, and are not so much opposed to the making of some concessions as many of the people of Upper Canada seem to imagine. If we had been informed as to what was coming, I think we certainly should have gone into some arrangement towards suiting the views of Upper Canada, by increasing her share of control on the revenue, rather than be compelled