

## THE IRISH IN CANADA; THE IMPORTATION OF FENIANISM.

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE THE ST. PATRICK'S SOCIETY, AT CITY  
CONCERT HALL, MONTREAL, JANUARY 11TH, 1865.

MR. MCGEE said: Ladies and Gentlemen, I deserve no credit for coming here to-night from Quebec, at some personal inconvenience, as my friend, the President, has said, for this is the annual meeting of the St. Patrick's Society, in aid of its charitable fund: this is our yearly offering to the poor of our own origin—an offering made in the middle of winter, when all the glowing zeal of charity is called for to kindle the hearthstones of those who have, perhaps, at this hour neither food nor fuel, nor any other friends but ourselves. We are here in the best room in the city—brilliant with lights and fair faces and fine dresses; but we are here to remember those who are debarred by bitter poverty from entering these happy walls, from witnessing these pleasant scenes, for whom we have to think and act, and, so far as we can, for whom we have also to make provision suited to this trying season. If it were at all within the possibilities, I could not do otherwise than be here; but I frankly own to you I had some additional reasons in desiring to be present this evening. This society has been always very kind to me, as, indeed, I think I may say every society among us has been in its turn. Now, I, on my part, am ready to do my *petit possible* for them all; I endeavour not to abuse their confidence, and I ask but one recompense—the privilege of unrestricted freedom of speech, within the bounds of modesty and discretion. There are one or two subjects on which I desire to exercise that privilege, without which my presence here would be worse than

useless both to you and to me; and the first of them is, to say a few words, which I may have no other opportunity of saying, on behalf of an admirable object, for which a reverend gentleman from Ireland is at present canvassing the city—I allude to the Rev. Mr. Beausang, of the Catholic University of Ireland. Being so long out of old Ireland, fully conscious of the changes that have taken place in myself and in the circle of my own friends during sixteen years, I always speak with great diffidence when I venture to give any public expression to opinions on Irish topics of the day. Moreover, gentlemen, as you may have observed, I do not belong to the Jefferson Brick school of politicians (Jefferson, you may remember, was of opinion that his leading articles in the "Rowdy Journal" made the Czar shake in his shoes at St. Petersburg). I have rather avoided than sought to parade in public the often-abused name of our glorious "old country." I have avoided doing so, because I feel no stirrings of national gratification in presenting my native land in the character of an habitual victim, or a perpetual plaintiff; or an unsatisfied petitioner for the cold world's pity. I dislike as much as Moore did that she should

"Yearly kneel before our masters' doors!  
And hawk her wrongs as beggars do their sores!"

I consider it the part of true patriotism not to jeopardise the position of the Irish in these British Provinces—half a million strong or thereabouts—by idle or irritating retrospective controversies; by fighting over again the battle of the Boyne; or disputing about the merits of the illustrious Prince, who was the victor, and the unfortunate King, who was the vanquished in that eventful contest. The Irish mind has been fed too much on stimulants and too little on solids: and this, among other reasons, is one of my strongest motives for desiring the secure establishment of an University of their own, springing from amongst and congenial to the spirit of the Irish Catholics still in Ireland. On this view, I may say I hope without presumption, that I saw with very great regret, but still greater surprise, Lord

Palmerston's refusal to grant a Parliamentary charter to that University. There are at present two Universities recognised by law in Ireland—Trinity College, and what are popularly known as "The Godless Colleges." I have every disposition and every right to speak with respect of Trinity College, although it is, and always has been, exclusively Anglican in all its statutes, tests, and honours. No Irishman can forget that it was the *Alma Mater* of almost all our most famous public men, of Anglo-Irish stock, from its first and greatest scholar, James Usher, to its last and not least ornament, Isaac Butt. No Catholic Irishman will consent to part with the reputation of William Conyngham Plunkett, of T.C.D., because he was the son of a dissenting minister, and educated at the cost of the congregation; or with our beloved Goldsmith, because he was the son and brother of a parson, nor with Jonathan Swift, because he was a parson himself. Long—I say in all sincerity—long may old Trinity flourish and be found famous; however tenaciously she may cling to her Elizabethan statutes, tests, and distinctions. None of us, men of the Emancipation era, should ever forget that her present venerable Provost, Dr. Macdonnell (father of the present Lieut.-Governor of Nova Scotia, and uncle of my friend Dr. Macdonnell, of this city), was one of the first signers, in 1828, of the Dublin Protestant petition on behalf of Catholic emancipation; nor, to descend from bold deeds, as that was in those days, to gentle courtesies, none of us, I trust, have forgotten the marked attentions paid to Cardinal Wiseman by that thorough scholar and thorough Irishman, Dr. Todd, when some years ago the learned Cardinal visited the College. Irish zealots on all sides, there and then, were quietly rebuked, when the scholarship of Trinity rendered its due but dignified recognition to the acquirements and genius of a prince of scholars and a prince of the Roman Church. But while we can and do respect Old Trinity, with all its dogmas and distinctions, we look—I hope every right-minded Irishman, Protestant or Catholic, looks with distrust amounting to hostility on all godless colleges. Never once for her thirteen hundred years of Christian

annals have religion and science been considered irreconcilable in Ireland—never have they been other than help-mates to each other—never has the decree of their utter divorce been pronounced until our own days, and never, I trust, either now or hereafter, can that unnatural divorce be carried into effect. Speaking as a layman—as a politician, if you choose—I repeat, with all deference, that it seems to me a most calamitous mistake for the Imperial authorities to make war upon the laudable ambition of the Irish mind, to found for Catholics a Catholic University, and to have its *status* fixed by legislative enactment. But I will not dwell upon this subject farther than to commend to my countrymen and co-religionists who are here the cause which brings the present delegate of that University, the Rev. Mr. Beausang, among us. There is another subject which more immediately concerns ourselves, in Montreal and in Canada, which has lately occupied a good deal of the attention of the press—I allude to the alleged spread of a seditious Irish society, originating at New York, whose founders have chosen to go behind the long Christian record of their ancestors, to find in days of Pagan darkness and blindness an appropriate name for themselves. A statement having been made the other day in the *Toronto Globe*, on the authority of its Montreal Correspondent, that there were 1500 of these contemporary pagans in Montreal—a statement made I am sure without intentional malice on the Correspondent's part—I felt bound, as I suppose you may have seen, to deny absolutely that statement. The denial was not given in my own words, but the alleged fact was denied, and that was the main point. I now, in your presence, repeat that denial on behalf of the Irish Catholics of this city; I say there could not be 15 such scamps associated and meeting together, not to say 1500, without your knowledge and mine; and I repeat absolutely that there is no such body amongst us, and that the contrary statements are deplorably untrue and unjust, and impolitic as well as unjust. I regret that papers of great circulation should lend themselves to the propagation of such statements, which have a direct tendency to foster



and enhance the very evil they intend to combat. See what the result has been in some parts of Upper Canada. Any two or more nervous or mischievous magistrates—and with 11,000 men in the commission of the peace there must be some of both these sorts—any two or more of these may subject a neighbourhood to all the rigours of martial law. Already indecent and unauthorised searches have been made for concealed arms in Catholic churches; already, as in some of the towns of Bruce, the magistrates are very improperly, in my opinion, arming one class of the people against the other. What consequences of evil may flow from this step, should make any responsible man shudder. And what is it all owing to? Why, to these often invented, and always exaggerated, newspaper reports. Observe the absurd figure Upper Canada is made to cut in all this business—the Protestant million are made to tremble before a fraction of a fraction: for if there are Fenians in that quarter of the world, I venture to say they are as wholly insignificant in numbers as in every other respect. At the risk, however, of sharing the fate of all unmasked advisers, I would say to the Catholics of Upper Canada, in each locality, if there is any, the least proof that this foreign disease has seized on any, the least among you, establish at once, for your own sakes—for the country's sake—a *cordon sanitaire* around your people; establish a Committee which will purge your ranks of this political leprosy; weed out and cast off those rotten members who, without a single governmental grievance to complain of in Canada, would yet weaken and divide us in these days of danger and anxiety. Instead of sympathy for the punishment they are drawing upon themselves, there ought to be general indignation at the perils such wretches would, if permitted to exist among us, draw upon the whole community, socially, politically, and religiously. How would any Catholic who hears me like to see the parish church a stable, and St. Patrick's a barrack? How would our working men like to see our docks desolate, our canals closed, our 1100 new buildings arrested, ruin in our streets, and famine shivering among the ruins? And this is what

these wretched conspirators, if they had the power, would bring to pass as surely as fire produces ashes from wood, or cold produces ice from water. I repeat here, deliberately, that I do not believe in the existence of any such organisation in Lower Canada—certainly not in Montreal; but that there are or have been emissaries from the United States among us, for the purpose of establishing it, has been so often and so confidently stated, that what I have said on the general subject will, I hope, not be considered untimely or uncalled for. By the law of Lower Canada the administration of an oath of membership in any secret, seditious society is a penitentiary offence, punishable by twenty years' imprisonment; and the taking of such an oath is punishable by seven years' imprisonment. By the law of the Church, membership in any such society, if persevered in, entails, *ipso facto*, the penalty of excommunication. I will just refer to an excellent recent work, the *Lectures on Modern History*, by Professor Robertson, of the Catholic University of Ireland, where the chief decrees on this subject, collated by Professor Murray, of Maynooth College, show that Pope Clement XII., Pope Benedict XIV., Pope Leo XI., Pope Pius VII., and the present Pope Pius IX., have all strongly condemned these societies. (Mr. McGee here cited the titles of the several decrees by which this description of societies had been condemned.) By all those solemn Acts of ecclesiastical legislation, secret seditious societies are expressly and in the most emphatic terms condemned; and as we, in this Society, are all Catholics, I feel that I am justified in strengthening my own position by a circumstantial reference to those august authorities. *Causa finita est!*

Mr. President,—I have been led to speak at greater length than is usual with me on these occasions, because I may not again for some months have an opportunity of meeting you all, face to face. We, the Irish inhabitants of Montreal, are doing very well as we are. We are, young and old, some 30,000; our mechanics compare favourably with those of any other origin; our young professional men are putting forth the promise of great talents; our

civil and religious rights are respected by all our fellow-citizens, whose equal rights we, in turn, equally respect. I dare assert—and I speak from some degree of knowledge—that there is not, take them for all in all, a more respectable community of Irishmen and their descendants to be found anywhere throughout the New World. I say this with pride—for it is a proud thing to be able to say. When I contemplate this community, rejoicing, as I well may, in their joy, and sharing in their trials,—when I contemplate their peaceful, steady, onward career, exacting respect and confidence on all sides, I cannot but feel keenly that any newspaper, here or elsewhere, should attempt to asperse them as a band of conspirators, or that any one should dare associate them, as a body, with lawless and anti-social designs. Mr. President, any good cause you know, and I trust every one who knows me knows, can at any time command my slender services; but you will continue to grant me, as I am sure our fellow-citizens at large will grant me, the cherished right of unrestricted free speech whenever I am called out to address either a special society or the general body of the citizens of Montreal. I have exercised that right to the full to-night; forgive me if I have gone beyond my limits: it was my zeal for your welfare, believe me, that prompted what I have mentioned to you. But this I think I may say, that wherever the flag above us is at stake—wherever our community is in question—we will be found by word and deed to shed the last of our Irish blood in defence of the inestimable liberties we enjoy, in common with all classes of Her Majesty's Canadian subjects.

## PART II.

### SPEECHES IN CANADIAN PARLIAMENT.

---

#### "THE DOUBLE MAJORITY."\*

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, TORONTO, APRIL 28TH, 1859.

MR. MCGEE said that last year the hon. member for Cornwall moved a resolution almost identical with that now before the House, and that he (Mr. McGee) had felt it his duty to support it. If there had been in this session of Parliament, from the beginning of it till the present time, a valuable moment for those who professed to entertain moderate views, and to be possessed of influence in the country to make those known, and that influence felt throughout the length and breadth of the land, it was, he contended, in the very debate in which they were then engaged. In all probability that was the last debate which would ever take place in a United Legislature sitting in the chief city of Upper Canada. He presumed that the Government intended to go for four years to Quebec, and then to remove to Ottawa, there permanently to reside—which, though situated in Upper Canada, could not be said to be so peculiarly Upper Canadian as the city of Toronto. Therefore it was that he had said that this would be the last important debate in a United Legislature sitting in

\* This was a constitutional expedient, by which it was proposed, that as Upper and Lower Canada had an equal number of members, under the Union Act, no legislation "should be forced upon either, without the consent of its own majority." It subsequently failed in practice.

Upper Canada. They were first of all to go to Quebec for four years; but where, he would ask, was the guarantee that the Union would last four years in the present condition of the Province? When they heard leading representatives of the people who occupied seats in that House, instituted under and by virtue of the Union, give utterance to disunion sentiments; when they heard such sentiments loudly proclaimed from one side of the House, and echoed tauntingly back from the other, and when they heard gentlemen declare "well, let a severance of the Union come—we are prepared for it," these, he asserted, were strong symptoms and unmistakeable indications of what the feeling of both sections of the Province was on that point. If the Government believed the Union workable, or that it could be made workable, it was their most solemn duty to have rebuked such sentiments. But their very silence showed that their belief was that the present Union was not workable; that its dissolution was a mere matter of time; that it was on its last legs, and that it was either unworthy of being defended or incapable of any defence at all. Where could it have been with more propriety defended than in the chief city in Upper Canada, and in the course of a debate in which sentiments diametrically opposed to Union had been uttered? He had no doubt in his own mind that they would find the difficulties which had distracted the Legislature during this session, as well as the last, would assume a greater degree of gravity in Quebec. And why? The hon. member for Montmorency had talked eloquently and well upon the necessity of compromise, and no man recognised the importance of that doctrine more than he (Mr. McGee) did, for the spirit of compromise was the spirit of harmony; but where was it desirable that that compromise should be made? He (Mr. McGee) would answer, on that very spot, in the chief city in Upper Canada, and in the presence of the people of Upper Canada. If the hon. gentleman was as bold a statesman as he was an advocate in that House, that was the place to settle the difficulties arising between both sections. Could it be reasonably expected that hon. mem-

bers from Upper Canada, in the presence of a strange race and away from their own soil, would yield so readily to arguments and proposals of compromise? No. If the present Union was at all defensible—if it could be upheld—this was the time, this was the occasion, to prove it. He (Mr. McGee) had lost no opportunity of making himself acquainted with the feelings of the people throughout the country, and he was convinced that he did not exaggerate when he said that there existed such a spirit of disunion in the upper section of the Province; and he would add, on the authority of members of French origin in Lower Canada too, that if this cry of disunion were raised it would be popular. Had the end of the Union then arrived? If so, let it not be announced by the outcry of the passions of people, nor yet let it be heralded by passionate debates on the part of their representatives. Let those whose duty it is to steer the ship of State direct it in the proper path, and if the evil must come let them find expedients to break the shock. It was said in common conversation that the Home Government would never permit a dissolution of the Union. They could only reason upon that point from analogy, and nothing, he contended, was more common in their colonial history than such an event. New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were formerly one province, and had been separated by the action of the Imperial Government. Cape Breton had been separated and re-annexed to Nova Scotia, as Labrador had been to Newfoundland. This Upper Province belonged originally to the province of Quebec—was separated from it in 1791, and re-united half a century later. Judging from the colonial policy which the mother country had ever pursued, there is nothing more certain than that, if a dissolution of the Union was strongly pressed for, it would not be refused. He spoke impartially. He had as deeply at heart, he had as great a reverence for, the religious institutions of Lower Canada as any Lower Canadian could have. And he had never sat by and heard them attacked without putting forward his decided protest against such utterances. In that respect he was certain he felt as strongly as anybody could do for the preservation of

the social and religious institutions of Lower Canada, and if they were attacked—and might that day be far distant—his duty would be to unite himself heartily with those who defended their hearths and their altars. On the other hand, he had a very deep, strong, and sincere feeling of interest in the people of Upper Canada. He belonged to them by birth; he had a great deal in common with them; one-third of them were emigrants like himself, and he could therefore speak impartially on the subject. In that spirit he would say that, badly as they got on under the present system, they would get on much worse if the Union were severed. The radical evil did not lie so much in the system as in that insatiable thirst for office which made every man believe himself a born statesman, and imagine that he should succeed to office after occupying a seat for twelve months in that House. Too many of them desired by illegitimate means to attain to wealth, to have a hand in a job, and surreptitiously to arrive at a position to the attainment of which men in other countries were willing to devote the best and the greater portion of well-spent lives. This spirit he regarded as dangerous—as the rock against which they would split if proper caution was not used. That was the spirit which would prove their ruin, and which would produce a dissolution of the Union. It would be doubly productive of evil in Quebec, as there the French Canadian influence would be stronger, and consequently the suspicions of the people of Upper Canada would be more aroused.

Mr. CAUCHON—That will strike in both ways.

Mr. McGEE—That is your view of sound policy. The hon. gentleman thinks Lower Canada has now the power and will keep it.

Mr. CAUCHON—I never said so. I hope you don't want to misrepresent me. What I said was that we ought not to make any concession to Upper Canada without being well aware of what we are doing.

Mr. McGEE said that such grave issues as those between the two sections of the Province ought not of course to be settled without mature deliberation. The hon. gentleman

then went on to say that he regarded the taunts the hon. member for Montmorency had uttered that night, and in which he was encouraged by hon. gentlemen opposite, respecting the gentlemen who had been called upon to form the Administration of August last, as most unjust. To suppose it possible that great questions, some of which had been fructifying and fermenting since the Union, could be settled in forty-eight hours, was an absurdity. He would not have alluded to this matter, did it not incidentally show the existence of an unfriendly desire to place public men unfairly before the House and the country—in a position in which their influence must be endangered, instead of taking them as they were, and giving them an opportunity of being useful so long and as far as possible. Instead of being treated in such a spirit, they were attacked with harshness, severity, and unfairness. So long as such a spirit existed, it showed clearly that it was not desired that they should grow into one nation; it showed that the theory—that Canada would be one nation—which existed in the mind of Lord Sydenham and his advisers, had been abandoned on both sides, and that no nearer approach could be made towards its fulfilment. On the contrary, he was one of those who desired that if the present system were displaced, it should be only to make way for a more complete and perfect union. As one who looked forward to the speedy growth of this great Province into an incipient nationality, which, in the fulness of time, and with the consent of the parent State, was to take its place among the nations of the New World; as one who did not believe that prospect to be all a dream; as one who looked forward with confidence to that glorious consummation, he would say that it was now the solemn duty of the gentlemen who occupied the Treasury Benches to speak seriously one last parting word to Upper Canada on a question which most vitally concerned her; and, on the important occasion of bidding her adieu, show some reasonable grounds for adopting or rejecting the resolutions of the hon. member for Cornwall.



## CONSTITUTIONAL DIFFICULTIES BETWEEN UPPER AND LOWER CANADA.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, QUEBEC, MAY 2ND, 1860.

MR. BROWN (Toronto) having moved a series of resolutions affirming the necessity of constitutional changes in the relations of Upper and Lower Canada,

MR. MCGEE said—I have no intention of detaining the House by speaking at any great length, and still less of following in anything like detail, the observations made last night by the member for North Hastings (Mr. Benjamin). I listened to the hon. gentleman's speech throughout, with a great deal of attention, but I failed to perceive any conclusive argument in all that he said. The exposition he made to this House reminded me of Falstaff's "penny-worth of bread to such an unconscionable quantity of sack." (Laughter.) But, though I do not intend to follow in argument, as I must follow in point of time, the hon. member for North Hastings, if the House will allow me, I shall offer some views which I have formed for myself, from a careful perusal of the political records of this Province, as well as of the sister colonies of British North America, and after giving them all the attention I could, both during the recess and during former sessions, when I had the honour of attending this House, and had the use of its valuable library, the most valuable possession we have, I shall offer to the House with great deference the views which I considered it my duty to form in relation to this question, which differs most materially from any other question that can come before this House. On every other occasion, we are either debating a particular expenditure, or we are for or against a particular law, but in

this discussion we have raised the long previous question, whether or not we ought to be here—whether it is true that, at this moment, this House and the co-ordinate branches of the Legislature, are governing this country, according to the prevailing theory in Canada of Responsible Government. We are debating the tenure of our own existence, whether we have fulfilled the conditions of that tenure, and whether it is for the advantage of our constituents that that tenure should be prolonged. That is a question of much more serious scope than the propriety of any particular expenditure, which may take place under our form of Government, or any particular Act which we may either pass here or reject. I may observe, Mr. Speaker, before going farther, that this is not the first time, nor the second, nor the third, that the Constitution of Canada has been under discussion in Assemblies similar to our own. Sir Henry Cavendish's report of "The debates on the Quebec Bill" in the Imperial Parliament, in 1774, are familiar to most members of this House. That discussion occupied the Commons of Great Britain nine days, and engaged the earnest attention of the ablest statesmen of the first half of George the Third's reign; yet in 1774, there were, according to Sir Guy Carleton, not above 400 British settlers in all Canada, and not more than 90,000 inhabitants altogether, including, I suppose, the Aborigines. The first Constitution continued in force till 1791—seventeen years; it was then abolished; two provinces were created; local legislatures, consisting of an executive head and two chambers each, were granted to Upper and Lower Canada. The discussion on the Canada Act of 1791 occupied the Commons of Great Britain six days, and were sustained by the first statesmen of that generation. That was the discussion which was chiefly dwelt upon, and most largely quoted from by the member for Toronto. It was a discussion very remarkable in every respect, because it coincided in point of time with the great debate on first principles, which at that day occupied the minds of all the statesmen in the civilised world. The great issues raised by the French Revolution were then novel to the minds of men, and even

the Canada Act of 1791 got entangled in the consideration of the general principles involved in the discussion of the issues raised by the French Revolution, and as the member for Hastings said last night, led to the rupture of a political and personal friendship of twenty-five years' standing, between two of the most illustrious statesmen of Great Britain, Mr. Burke and Mr. Fox—a rupture, however, which did not grow, as he said, out of the merits of the Canada Bill, but from the introduction of French politics into the debate by Burke, as was charged by his former friend Fox,—unjustly and unnecessarily. The constitution adopted in 1791 differed very materially from that adopted in 1774, and continued for twenty or thirty years, without encountering any formidable criticism or censure. It went into effect in Lower Canada at once, and in Upper Canada in 1796. It was called in those days the “New Constitution,” and had its eulogists and enthusiastic admirers. We have an anecdote in Christie’s “History of Canada,” that when Prince Edward, father of her present Majesty, and grandfather of the young Prince, whom we expect soon to see amongst us, visited this colony, he quelled an election riot at Charlesbourg, in this neighbourhood (Quebec), by appealing to the merits of the “New Constitution,” and the advantages Canadians had obtained under it. After a full and fair trial, however, the New Constitution was found not to work well. It was found that the colony had outgrown it. Time and experience, those great instructors of all statesmen, who are not wilfully blind or hopelessly incapable, proved wiser than Lord North in 1774, than Mr. Pitt and his colleagues in 1791, exposed many gaps and vacant spaces in the once lauded constitution, and pointed out many occasions and many reasons for change, improvement, addition, and amendment. Dissatisfaction strongly manifested itself in Lower Canada about the year 1822. The relations of the Executive and Legislature were not defined. The relations of the Judiciary to the Executive and Legislature were not defined. The House of Assembly had spent the greater part of two sessions, 1818 and 1819, in impeaching the Chief Justice and three or four of the

other Judges. They claimed the power of impeachment, while the Upper Chamber asserted its competency to sit as a court of impeachment. This raised a great constitutional question, which was referred by Lord Dalhousie to the Prince Regent's Government; but, though it was taken into consideration, no decision on the point has been given by the Home Government from that day to this. (Hear, hear.) In 1822, this section of the Province, then by far the most populous, was before the House of Commons as a petitioner for constitutional changes. It was at that time gradually becoming accustomed to Constitutional Government, which at first, of course, it was not. For it is a curious fact—a fact, perhaps, the dregs of which are not yet entirely worked out of the social state of Lower Canada,—that the majority of Lower Canadians did not themselves in the first place wish for Constitutional Government, having been trained under the military system of Montcalm and his predecessors, to a preference for submission to military power. When the Constitution of 1774 was proposed, the French population of Lower Canada petitioned almost to a man against it, and declared they did not wish to be inflicted with an Assembly. They pointed out how Assemblies in other colonies had led to conflict between the colonists and the Crown, and also to their lavish expenditure of public money. But after a few years were past, when the generation which saw the substitution of the flag of Great Britain for the flag of France had passed away, and when a generation familiarised with constitutional practices grew up, the public men, of the legal profession especially, and some of the medical profession, and some of the seignors of the country, began to warm towards a constitutional system, and the ambition which had formerly been directed to the career of arms, transferred its hopes to the legislature, so that it became a source of triumph and pride to have a seat in either the Upper or Lower branch of the governing body of the country. But, as that constitutional feeling grew strong, so also grew strong the dissatisfaction of the people with the defective system introduced in 1791. Accordingly, in 1822, the Commons

of Lower Canada appeared as petitioners at the bar of the House of Commons, in England; the same year Mr. Maryatt, M.P., was appointed their agent in the Imperial Parliament; and in 1823 Mr. Speaker Papineau was sent to London to obtain a redress of grievances. In 1828 Mr. Huskisson's "Canada Committee" sat, and they, in their report, conclude that no changes short of "an impartial, conciliatory, and constitutional system," will be attended with the desired effect—the pacification of the Province at large. In 1832, Mr. Wm. Lyon Mackenzie carried to London a petition signed by 24,000 inhabitants of Upper Canada, against the scheme of union then in preparation; in 1834, the ninety-two resolutions of Lower Canada, and the report of the "Committee on Grievances" in Upper Canada, sufficiently proved that the system would not work; yet it was not until the unsuccessful insurrection of 1837 and '38 challenged the attention of Imperial statesmen to the necessity for "Constitutional Remedies," that they entered in good earnest on their consideration. The measure proposed in 1839 was, however, postponed till the next year, when Canadian affairs occupied the House of Commons six or eight days; the result was, the present Act of Union, now in its twentieth year, and which we, on this side, propose to subject to the same test of experience—of fitness to our present circumstances—which the statesmen of 1840 employed towards the Constitution of 1791, and the statesmen of 1791 applied to the Constitution of 1774. (Hear, hear.) A century has not passed since the Treaty of Paris handed over this country to Great Britain; yet, in that century, it has existed under five different forms of Government. For fourteen years it was governed by a military executive; for seventeen years it was ruled as a Crown Colony, by a Governor and Council; for forty years and upwards it was ruled as two distinct Provinces, with one chamber filled by election and one by nomination, in each section; and at this moment it is governed by a single Legislature, but with both branches elective since 1854, and the Executive Ministers, in theory at least, responsible for their official

acts to the people and Parliament of Canada only. The debates of 1774, of 1791, and of 1840, show, Mr. Speaker, how deeply the best minds in the Empire were exercised in planning the fabric, and proportioning the parts of the several systems under which this Province has been governed for the last hundred years. In reading over those debates, we are overawed at the fulness of information, at the generous forecast, the enlightened wisdom of many of the men who have gone before us, in considering the constitution of Canada; but we are no less struck, Mr. Speaker, by the fact, that all their plans have been materially modified and amended by time. Time and experience have proved wiser counsellors than the wisest of men; time and experience have condemned Lord North's attempt, and every other attempt, to establish the Church of England in any portion of Canada, as the State Church; time and experience have condemned Mr. Pitt's attempt to make seats in the Legislative Council hereditary; and to these same high authorities—time and experience—we now appeal against the defects, the radical defects in Lord John Russell's constitution of 1840. What were the circumstances which surrounded the introduction of that constitution into Canada? Both Upper and Lower Canada had been agitated to their depths by the unsuccessful insurrection of 1837 and 1838. The swell and clamour of the storm had not disappeared, when the high commanding voice of Lord Durham was heard above all other voices, propounding remedies—immediate and permanent remedies—for the state of the Province. The report of that noble Lord completes the evidence of the Imperial care of Canada exhibited in the discussions of 1791 and 1774. It is, as I am sure every one in this House will admit, a document above all praise, above all price; it is such a report as Timoleon might have made to the Corinthian Senate, when sent to deliver their descendants, the Syracusans, from the double-headed monster, despotism and anarchy. Lord John Russell was, naturally enough, deeply imbued with the sentiments of Lord Durham; he became Colonial Secretary in the Melbourne ministry of 1839,

greatly to the satisfaction of his friend, Lord Sydenham, who accepted at the same time the office of Governor-General of the British North American Colonies. It was agreed between the Melbourne ministry and Lord Sydenham—before he could have any other knowledge of the actual state of Upper and Lower Canada, than that gleaned from Lord Durham's report and Lord Durham's conversation—that the Legislative Union was to be carried. It was decided upon as a necessary measure, from an Imperial point of view, in order to prevent the recurrence of the events of 1837 and 1838, and in order to strengthen the connection with Great Britain. I do not pretend to say that all considerations local to Canada were underrated or omitted from the deliberations of the Melbourne Administration—I do not even say that the Imperial view they took was not the view which even the most patriotic Canadian—reasoning now long after the fact—might not have taken could he have foreseen its actual consequences; but I do say, that the measure of Union passed in 1840 was conceived in an Imperial spirit, that it was urged on by Imperial, rather than Provincial motives and interests, and that advantage was taken of the temporary agitation and reaction, in this country, to force it, all imperfect as it was, into premature operation. (Hear, hear.) Honourable gentlemen, its defenders and eulogists in this House, may speak fondly of it as “our constitution”—and “our invaluable constitution”—but it cannot be called ours in its conception nor in its execution. Before the Act of 1774 was passed, Canadian witnesses were examined by the Imperial Parliament; Sir Guy Carleton, Chief Justice Hay, Baron Maseres, and M. de Lotbiniere, were examined; before the Act of 1791 was passed, Mr. Lymburner, a very able man, a citizen of Quebec, was examined on behalf of the British inhabitants of Lower Canada, and other colonists had been consulted by correspondence: but in framing the provisions of the Act of 1840 no such preliminary consultation with leading colonists had taken place. It was resolved upon in England before Lord Sydenham left; and that energetic nobleman prided himself, especially on the celerity with

which he carried the foregone conclusion of his colleagues into effect. He gave the Special Council of Lower Canada less than a week's time to deliberate—he gave the Parliament of Upper Canada a fortnight; after listening to both he heeded neither; he confesses in his private correspondence that he thought the best thing for Lower Canada "would be ten years more of despotism;" but *he* could not personally afford to wait ten years; he had arrived in the last week of October, 1839, and he boasted, within two months from that date, before the end of December, he had carried the Union, so far as Canada could assent or make submission. (Hear, hear.) And this is the origin of the measure—the work of two or three men, done in a hurry, in two short months—which is spoken of in the same sense as the British Constitution—the work of many generations of men—the foundations of which, like Cologne Cathedral, were the work of one age, the superstructure of another, the completion of a third, the embellishment of a fourth; which is compared to the American Constitution, the product of the wisest men, gathered in from the Kennebec to the Altamira, sitting in conclave, under the presidency of a Washington, or engaged in the discussions of the "Federalist" or the Forum for seven whole years together! Mr. Speaker, there is no sanctity of age about this Constitution of ours; we cannot invoke its provisions as "the wisdom of our ancestors!" neither were the means by which it was carried, such as to surround it with any great halo of glory. There was no chivalric gathering, such as met at Runnymede; no learned assembly, such as sat at Annapolis; the free voices of the people were not heard demanding it; no fair representation of the people existed at the time even in Upper Canada: it was carried by sheer Imperial influence, executive address, and the advance of £1,500,000 sterling for public works.—The Sydenham loan carried the Sydenham Union, and the instrument thus framed deserves for its origin no other reverence than such as may fairly be attached to its authors, Lord Sydenham and Lord John Russell. It is in this sense Lord Grey speaks of Lord Sydenham, as having



"assumed the government;" and that Lord Metcalfe, in his despatch to Lord Stanley, of the 5th of May, 1843, speaks of Lord Sydenham, as "the fabricator of the form of Government now existing in this Province." — When hon. gentlemen attribute to "the Act of Union" the advantages which have sometimes flowed from the system of responsible government, they commit, it seems to me, a serious anachronism. Responsible government is nowhere conceded in the Act of Union. (Hear, hear.) Neither Lord Sydenham, nor his second and ablest successor, Lord Metcalfe, recognised "responsible government" in the sense we now use it, as inherent in the Act of Union. As Lord Metcalfe observes of his predecessor, he "scouted the idea" of responsible government in his despatches. After the Union was consummated at Kingston, he practically accepted it, or submitted to circumstances he could not control, by admitting that members of the Executive Council ought not to continue such, when they ceased to command the confidence of a majority of this House. Lord Metcalfe certainly did not recognise that theory; nor did the Colonial Ministers, his immediate superiors; Lord Elgin, so bitterly abused yesterday from the benches opposite, may be called the first Governor-General who acted consistently on the theory—and he did not arrive here till the seventh year after the Union. Let us, therefore, not confound two things—the Act of 1840 and the establishment of responsible government; let us not credit to a false cause whatever good results have sprung from another, and a subsequent advance towards legislative independence. And, after all, in what does this "responsibility" of ministers to this House or the country consist? On the vigilance and patriotism of the majority of the House I admit it ought to depend; but on what does it really depend? I answer—and the records of our recent as well as of our earlier politics under the Union bear me out—it depends as much, if not more, on the personal qualities of the Governor sent us—on his capacity, his firmness, and his superiority to personal influences—as on the will of this House. It does not exist in your Union Act, nor in any

other fundamental law. It exists mainly in the personal character of the Governor. When you get a Governor who respects public opinion, who has had a constitutional training, who is by temper as well as by information fit to be the head of a great constitutional State—which every public man chosen by favouritism or chance medley is not (hear, hear)—then you have Responsible Government; but not otherwise. (Hear, hear.) For it is a very different thing, Mr. Speaker, moving in a prescribed orbit, as ministers in England, carrying out a constitution which every body around them habitually obeys, from trying to work an ill-defined constitution, in a new state of society, supplementing the defects of that constitution out of the resources of your own wisdom, and justice and foresight. That constitution which depends on the will of any one man, however high he may be, or the will of any number of men, is no constitution, is undeserving the name of a constitution. I know very well that the theory is, that ministers cannot remain in office without being sustained by a majority of this House. But there is another power which may have more to do with keeping them in office, under the present system, than a majority of this House, or their own electors, once they are elected. Give any ministry, however scraped together, a chamber of one hundred and thirty members, not divided by deep and broad party lines—give them, at the same time, a pliable, or partisan, or incapable Governor, who will permit them a profuse use of the public money, under the colour of “Orders in Council”—and such a ministry, however distrusted or detested in the country, may continue to rule this House for four consecutive years, or as long as such a Governor remains. Is it not so? Is not this the plainest lesson which Time and Experience have taught us from our existing constitution? And where, even with a new Parliament or a new Governor—where is the redress of the people against a bad minister? He may lay down his portfolio, and laugh us all to scorn. He may retire from official station, and you cannot follow him to the back benches or the cross benches. You cannot reach him.

when he is in—you cannot reach him when he is out. Where, then, is your “Responsible Government?” Can there be responsibility of ministers without a penalty? It seems to me there cannot. And if not, where is your penalty? Have you not the same radical defect which Mr. Grattan found in the constitution of his country, when he exclaimed, in allusion to the Roman *fusces*, “Ireland has no axe, and therefore she has no honest minister.” I am well aware that, practically, the power of impeachment has fallen into comparative disuse in England, and has been very rarely resorted to in the United States; but I know that it exists in the constitution of both—that it is not a dead letter—that it has been used with terrible effect in times past, just as the great guns under our windows, though silent now and somewhat rusted, can yet serve every purpose for which they were originally cast from the furnace, and mounted where they stand. But, sir, we are told by the hon. member for North Hastings, that we owe to the Union, unqualifiedly—apart from the system of responsibility—whatever monetary credit the Province has enjoyed the past dozen or twenty years. Sir, I am not a disunionist, and I hold, of course, that some form of union is essential to our common credit, and most beneficial to our common progress. I do not think it possible that Upper and Lower Canada, once separated, could advance, or command one means of progress—money—in anything like the proportion which they can, being united. Dissolution, “pure and simple,” as the phrase is, I consider very simple indeed; I consider it altogether retrograde; and I do not believe the youngest man in this House will ever live to see it. (Hear, hear.) But because I am a unionist, must I, therefore, be for this Act of Union and for no other? Or, is it even possible for me, or for any one, to stand by Lord Sydenham’s union at this time of day? Sir, it is not possible; for that union, such as it *was*, no longer exists; it has been frittered away, year by year, by Imperial legislation and by Provincial legislation, till it now hangs in tatters upon the expanding frame of this colony. Of its sixty-two clauses, no less than thirty have been repealed by

statute within the last ten years! The 4th clause, in relation to the Legislative Council, has been repealed; the required sanction of the two-thirds vote in Constitutional Changes has gone with that clause; the clauses from 13 to 25, inclusive, relating to elections—to the constitution of this House—have been repealed; the proviso of the 26th clause; and the whole of the 27th clause, relating to the same important subject, have been repealed; clause 41, making the English language the official language of the country, has been repealed; clause 42, reserving all legislation on ecclesiastical matters for the Sovereign's consent, has been repealed; clause 44, relating to Provincial Courts of Appeal, has been superseded; clauses 50 to 57, inclusive, constituting the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and schedules A and B of the Act referred to in those clauses, have all been repealed. And this is the shattered idol we are called upon to worship, as the image of life, and health, and power! So far as it defined the powers of this Chamber, or the composition of the other, the Act of Union is defunct; so far as it touched the delicate subjects of language and religion it is defunct; so far as it constituted Courts of Appeal, or legislated for the public credit, it is defunct; and in this carcass we are asked to place all our trust and all our dependence for future good government! But, I mistake—it is not altogether dead, though so dreadfully mutilated. There is still a little life left, which the Administration of the day draw hope from with desperate fidelity—the 12th section, decreeing an equality of representation, independent of population, and the 45th section, vaguely describing the powers of the Governor-General and the all-important “Orders in Council;” the section, also, limiting the duration of Parliament to four years, may be counted among the relics which remain. The equality clause was introduced, avowedly, into the Act, for the purpose of “swamping the French;” but that purpose has been defeated—and I rejoice that it has been defeated. (Hear, hear.) It was a deliberate conspiracy against the rights of one set of people—flagitious in the conception, and wholly indefensible in the enactment;

why, then, should it be maintained and enforced against another set? (Hear, hear.) Are we, of Lower Canada, to rule our fellow-subjects of Upper Canada, on the Pagan principle of the *lex talionis*? or, rather, on the Christian principle "of doing unto others as we would be done by?" I do not say that we should place ourselves or our institutions—differing so widely as we do from Upper Canadians—at their mercy; I mean nothing of the kind; I have never entertained any such idea. No! I believe that a remedy can be found by Upper Canada for her wrongs, and by Lower Canada ample safeguards for her rights; and I shall immediately, with permission of the House, though with very great self-distrust, indicate the nature of that remedy, as it suggests itself to my mind. But, before I do so, let me ask every candid man in this Assembly, whether he believes the present state of things in this Province can be much longer maintained? Are the people satisfied with the vague, unlimited power of the Executive over the public expenditure? Are they satisfied with the appointment of strong political partisans—often by their own colleagues—to the judicial bench? Are elections to this House conducted on a system calculated to inspire awe and obedience towards the laws we make? Is the character of this House elevated by the scenes which take place at our elections, by the notorious bribery and corruption which have been practised, by the fact that we met in 1858 with thirty-two seats in this House, out of 130, contested, with every fourth man in the House petitioned against? (Hear, hear.) Is it the fact that the character of this House has been raised of late years under the working of our present system? Is it the fact that a Lower Canadian majority persistently ruling the people of Upper Canada against their well-understood wishes, as expressed through their legitimate organs in this House—is that winning friends for the system in Upper Canada? (Hear, hear.) Is an elective Legislative Council, when it becomes wholly elective—as it soon will—is it, coming fresh from the people, likely to recognise in this Assembly the same monopoly of popular power which the House of Commons holds, in comparison

with the hereditary House of Lords? If, then, what remains of our constitution does not work satisfactorily—if the Legislature is losing the respect and confidence of the people—if the Judiciary even be sometimes looked upon with doubt, recruited as it is from the thick of the political conflict—if the Executive is not regarded with affection and respect by the country—if the three great divisions of the Government of the country have all sunk in the public estimation, then I put to any honest man the question, How does all this happen? Is it that our present rulers, the Executive, or the administrators of justice, or the representatives of the people in this House, are worse men, are more prone to despotism or corruption than those who have gone before them, or those who may come after them? I do not charge them with any innate depravity of that kind; but I charge the abuses, which have crept into the provisions of the Act of Union, or the omissions of the Act of Union—an instrument not strong enough to sustain official weakness against temptations to go beyond the strict line of official duty—an instrument which makes the weak weaker, and tempts and enables the corrupt to become more corrupt. (Hear, hear.) And I say, an instrument like that ought not to be held up to the respect of this House and of this country; and that it would be indeed a poor verdict on the intelligence of the people of Canada, if, after twenty-three years of peace following the last social commotion in this Province, if there are not men to be found in Canada at this day of sufficient wisdom to frame a much better instrument than Lord Sydenham improvised, and Lord John Russell imposed upon Upper and Lower Canada, regardless of the opposition of both. (Cheers.) Before I pass from this subject, there is one other point to which I must refer—the admitted necessity of Departmental Reform, which cannot be had under our present system. The Public Works Department is a fathomless abyss; our Public Domain does not pay the wages of its overseers; our Department of Agriculture and Statistics is without a head; our Emigration Service is unorganised; the only active agencies of administration

are to be found in the Taxing Department and the Suing Department—with the Finance Minister, the Postmaster, and the Attorney-General. Individual vigour, I admit, may do much towards a remedy; but the system ought to be such as to provide against individual weakness, and to render mediocrity comparatively harmless. This, Sir, I fear we never can have, with the present arrangement of nominal heads and irresponsible subordinates. We certainly have not hitherto had a satisfactory departmental system. (Hear, hear.) I have shown, I trust, that Lord Sydenham's Union did not originate in any view to the interests of Canada, though I do not allege but that the interests of Canada have been served by that instrument, up to a certain point. But I say it was not the act of the people of Canada. It was imposed on the people of Canada by Imperial authority alone. It was urged on to remove an irksome state of things in the Province itself, and to strengthen the connection with the mother country. It was hastened at a time when its chief advocate, the Governor-General of that day, would have needed to have been more than human, to have been above the impressions produced on his mind by all the conflicting stories and views pressed upon him, by men coming heated from the late social contest, many of whom had been actually in the *mêlée* of civil war. I admit that those who point out the defects of the present Union are bound to make a clear and strong case against it; and I think that clear and strong case has been made. (Hear, hear.) I speak not now so much of details, as of the broad and general facts. The details have been elaborated with great care in several publications; and, among others, in an excellent political document which the hon. member for North Hastings took as the text for his speech last night—the address of the Reform Convention lately held in Upper Canada. But, I suppose, upon this subject, we are all free companions on this side of the House, and each of us has some peculiar view of his own, which he will express, as I have risen to do, in pronouncing an opinion on the motion of the hon. member for Toronto. I should have preferred, I admit,

to have voted upon that motion with some modifications; but I am now debarred from doing so by the motion of the previous question moved by the member for Hastings; so that now we shall have to vote for or against it in the form in which it has been proposed. (Hear, hear.) As I am debarred from voting for any modification of that motion, I am prepared fully to concur in the opinion, that the Act of Union has not answered the designs of its projectors—that it has not fulfilled what they claim for it—that it has been already in great part repealed—that it has no longer, so to speak, “a leg to stand upon”—that it is not now in existence in this Province. The question, then, is a question of remedy. The hon. member for Hastings, last night, twitted the hon. member for Toronto that he had no remedy to propose. I have no doubt, when we come to that stage of the matter, remedies will be as thick as blackberries. I have no doubt every one who has ever opened a constitutional book will have his own scheme of the distribution of functions, and of joint authority, of the proportion of power to be exercised by the central authority, and the proportion to be retained by the local governments. There is no subject, perhaps, on which the human mind can exercise itself, so capable of endless combinations, as the question of civil government. Perhaps, even that science, the subtlest of all sciences, Theology, is not more full of acute distinctions than this comparatively modern science, of the formation of constitutions and the distribution of powers. Now my own humble view, which I offer to the House for what it is worth, is, that the remedy which will suit our circumstances, is a bold application of the federal principle. I am prepared to apply that remedy to our position with the sanction of the people of both sections of the Province, and not otherwise. But the best and most desirable thing, to my mind, is the Federal Union of all the North American colonies—and I think it not only a more desirable thing, but a more practical thing. I think every man in this House who has given careful consideration to the subject, must see that dissolution pure and simple is entirely out of the question; that an abso-



late dissolution of the Union is an impossibility. We are not our own masters in that respect at all events. We have to get the consent of the Empire, and the consent of the public creditor, and the whole tendency of these modern times, is against it. Every invention for diminishing the obstacle of space, for the multiplication of ideas, for the swifter communication of intelligence, is against it—art is against it—science is against it—nature is against it. Dissolution pure and simple, no man on the floor of this House, I believe, ever will live to see, should he live to be as old as the oldest of his ancestors. But, while I believe that to be neither the desirable nor the practical remedy, I say it is easier to obtain, and we have already obtained, the sanction of the Imperial authorities to enter into the consideration of the question of the general federation. Yet to work out this cure even with the sanction of the metropolitan power, much time for deliberation, and many mutual conferences, will be necessary. If the Legislatures of the Lower Colonies, and our own, were prepared for it, the initiative ought to be taken immediately upon the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, for even then, it would probably be 1864 or 1865 before all the obstacles could be removed, and all the arrangements agreed upon. It would, however, be something to hope for, and to work for, and to wait for, in the interim; it would occupy the hearts and minds of all the statesmen of all the colonies, and prepare them by correspondence and intercourse to act understandingly together, when they should come together. I rest the advocacy of a Federal Union of all the Provinces mainly on these grounds. *First*.—That a Unity of all the Provinces is desirable commercially, and would be beneficial to each. *Secondly*.—That a mere Commercial Union, such as the German Zollverein, without the superintendence of some central political power, would not give sufficient security for the interests of all members of the confederacy. *Thirdly*.—That such a union is a necessary complement of our present colonial system, unless we are to look forward to annexation to the United States. *Fourthly*.—That while the tendencies of our times are all in favour of such Unions,

the obstacles in our way are not greater than those which have been repeatedly overcome by other disunited States and Provinces. That a Union of the colonies is desirable commercially, was, I think, very clearly shown to this House two sessions since, by the present Finance Minister—though he did not then put his resolution to the vote. Had he done so, I should have felt it my duty to vote with him, as I did subsequently on the subject of an Inter-colonial Railway. It is desirable commercially for Canada, that we should have an addition of a million consumers to our domestic market. It is desirable that but one tariff and custom system should prevail throughout all these Provinces. How is it now? With half a dozen different tariffs and different currencies, with New Brunswick and Nova Scotia taxing each other's industry, and both taxing ours, is it possible we should grow in numbers or in wealth in the ratio of the conterminous New-England States? It is not possible, as we find to our cost. While the New England States average thirty inhabitants to the square mile, Canada averages but seven, and New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, taken together, but eleven. The statistics of Intercolonial trade, contrasted with our trade to the United States, shows what "a triangular duel" we are engaged in, at the expense of each other's safety and property. In 1857 we *exported* to the United States breadstuffs to the value of 1,776,250*l.*, or near \$9,000,000, while the two adjoining Provinces *imported* from the United States breadstuffs to the value of 408,000*l.*, or \$2,000,000. On the other hand we imported from the United States, West Indies produce to the value of \$1,500,000, while our exports to the West Indies were *nil*. New Brunswick, however, in the same year imported from the West Indies to the value of 40,000*l.*, and Nova Scotia to the amount of 322,000*l.*—in all, to the amount of say, \$1,800,000—a figure which shows how possible it is to carry on much of our West India trade through the agency of the sister Provinces. I instance only these two articles of commerce—West Indian goods and breadstuffs. But there are

other mediums of exchange between us. Nova Scotia has coal,—we have none; and fuel, at least in Lower Canada, we are told is becoming every day more scarce and dear: Upper Canada exports flour, and imports West Indian goods—fish and coal; we manufacture many articles which the Lower Provinces want, and they produce or can profitably procure us others which we require. What then is wanting to our mutually benefiting each other? I answer—intercourse—association—union. (Hear, hear.) It is argued that no intercourse exists, and, therefore, that no commerce could exist. Create the intercourse, and you create the commerce. Would the Reciprocity Treaty have been of any practical value to any portion of Canada, if it were not for the canals and railways on our side the line, and the other? There are the broad facts—a million of consumers at our own doors—our own fellow-subjects—with wants which we can supply, and commodities to exchange—yet they profit nothing from our vicinage, nor we by them. At this moment each of these Colonies is much more profitable to the United States than to Canada; we have reciprocity with strangers, but none with our fellow-subjects. When I place the necessity for a general federation on commercial grounds in the first instance, I do not mean to say, Mr. Speaker, that a mere commercial union without a central political power, could accomplish any great things. I know there is the example of the Zollverein, which, since 1838, has extended its circles from the Rhine to the Russian frontier—over 40,000,000 of consumers. Where would the Zollverein be, without the sustaining and directing power of Prussia? Where would any commercial union be without a tariff-making and treaty-making power? The experience of the Hanse towns and the Italian Republics—the experience even of those separated Provinces is full of instruction on this head. The territorial interests of New Brunswick were sacrificed in the Ashburton Territory, the ship-building interests of all our seaports were sacrificed in the Reciprocity Treaty—the American coasting trade has been lost to us, by the indifference of Imperial

statesmen—the interests of Newfoundland have three times been on the point of being given up to France within six or seven years. Can any one suppose that if we had a central political power—strong enough to protect every member of what Mr. Canning called “the Great British Confederacy” of North America—such things could ever happen again? My third ground is, Sir, that such a Union as I am considering is a necessary complement to our colonial representative system—unless we look forward—which I believe no one in this House does—to annexation to the United States. (Hear, hear.) Sir, we have already advanced too far for dependencies, to halt in our march towards nationality. On what principles that nationality will ultimately repose—whether on British or on American principles—whether we are likely to become part of a Northern Republic, flanked by Southern slavery, or a *secundo-geniture* in the royal family of England—I do not now mean to discuss. One thing is certain, we have advanced, and must continue to advance. The law of our youth is growth, the law of our growth is progress. Now, if to the next step, we are to take, as well as those we have taken in 1774, 1791, and 1840, the consent of the Empire is essential, can we have that consent for a dissolution of the Canadian Union? I think not. For a Canadian Federation? Possibly. For a general federation, retaining the connection? It has been given over and over again; Lord Grey, Sir Lytton Bulwer, Mr. Labouchere,—almost every Colonial Secretary of late years,—has declared it to be our own affair, with which the metropolitan power has no desire to interfere unfavourably. Nova Scotia is ripe for it; New Brunswick, as I had reason to believe last year, during a visit to that country, is not actively adverse to it; the political interest below Quebec will be in its favour; and the commercial interest in England is well disposed towards it. I hold in my hand petitions presented to the Imperial Parliament during the present year by many of the leading houses of Liverpool and Glasgow; the Cunards, Gilmores, Dunlops, Richardsons,

Gillespies,—names powerful alike on 'Change and in the reception room of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. These petitions not only show that it is commercially, but politically, desirable to draw all these colonies close together. The petitioners pray for an Imperial aid of 60,000*l.* a year for seven years, to complete the 400 miles of railway which would connect Halifax with Quebec. They point out that the defence of these colonies costs the Imperial Exchequer 420,000*l.* per annum, which this road would in great part supersede; and every argument for the road tells equally for the federation. Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I have said that the tendencies of our times are all in favour of such a Union as I speak of, while the obstacles in our way are not greater than have been often overcome by other separated States and Provinces. It is true, we are of unequal size, with unequal resources, and different degrees of indebtedness, but the local governments may harmonise all these inequalities. We are of different religions; yet the two great divisions of Christians—Catholics and Protestants—would be, as nearly as possible, balanced, in a union of all the colonies. We are a northern people, and must be a commercial people; the bonds of interest would therefore bind us. We would have in our favour the river system of the North, from the mouth of the Gulf to the head of Lake Superior. We have not a tithe of the difficulties to overcome which the fathers of the Swiss, Dutch, and American Confederacies overcame. Difficulties indeed there are, but none, Sir, in my humble judgment, which could not be got over in an amicable Conference of the Colonies; and as I once heard the hon. member from South Ontario (Mr. Mowatt) ask—"What are statesmen fit for, if not to overcome difficulties?" I cannot believe that any one here has a vested interest in the continuance of our disunion. There may be those who imagine that such a plan as I have sketched would prove fatal to their self-importance; who, as is said—I think unjustly said—of Julius Cæsar, "would rather be first in a village than second in Rome." We can understand that there might be such persons, even

in this House, but I believe there are other members of the Canadian Parliament endued with a wider vision and better aspirations—men who do not fear to meet in debate all the talents of all the Provinces; men, who would feel a generous satisfaction in confronting the ablest of their fellow-subjects in amicable controversy. For such men the prospect of a broader arena, and less manageable majorities, has no terrors; they would welcome with enthusiasm the dawning of the day which was to enlarge our horizon, and open before us new fields of labour and of honour. (Hear, hear.) I conclude, Sir, as I began, by entreating the House to believe that I have spoken without respect of persons, and with a sole single desire for the increase, prosperity, freedom, and honour of this incipient Northern nation. I call it a Northern nation—for such it must become if all of us do but do our duty to the last. Men do not talk on this continent of changes wrought by centuries, but of the events of years. Men do not vegetate in this age as they did formerly, in one spot, occupying one position. Thought outruns the steam car, and hope outflies the telegraph. We live more in ten years in this era than the patriarchs did in a thousand. The patriarch might outlive the palm-tree which was planted to commemorate his birth, and yet not see so many wonders as we have witnessed since the Constitution we are now discussing was formed. What marvels have not been wrought in Europe and America from 1810 to 1860?—and who can say the world—or our own portion of it more particularly—is incapable of maintaining till the end of the century the ratio of the past progress? I, for one, cannot presume to say so. I look to the future of my adopted country with hope, though not without anxiety; I see in the not remote distance, one great nationality bound, like the shield of Achilles, by the blue rim of ocean—I see it quartered into many communities—each disposing of its internal affairs—but all bound together by free institutions, free intercourse, and free commerce; I see within the round of that shield, the peaks of the Western mountains and the

crests of the Eastern waves—the winding Assinaboine, the five-fold lakes, the St. Lawrence, the Ottawa, the Saguenay, the St. John, and the Basin of Minas—by all these flowing waters, in all the valleys they fertilise, in all the cities they visit in their courses, I see a generation of industrious, contented, moral men, free in name and in fact,—men capable of maintaining, in peace and in war, a Constitution worthy of such a country. (The hon. gentleman resumed his seat amidst loud and general applause.)

## REPRESENTATION BY POPULATION.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, QUEBEC, MARCH 28TH, 1861.

MR. MCGEE—Suffering from a severe cold, as I am, Mr. Speaker (which rendered it physically impossible for me to be at the division last night), I shall not detain the House long in stating my reasons for the vote I intend to give. I wish distinctly to state, why, if I had been able to have been here last night, I should have voted against the proposition of Representation by Population, as introduced, though agreeing in the justice, and believing in the triumph of the principle as applied to the composition of this House. (Hear, hear.) Since I have had a seat in this House, I have always voted against that proposition, introduced singly and alone, because I believe we ought to have no fundamental change in this House, which was not to be accompanied by some simultaneous check introduced into other parts of the system. (Hear, hear.) Do gentlemen, who advocate this principle for this House, propose to apply it to the other House? I believe not. But what effective corrective will the other chamber, elective as it is, supply against the change to be wrought in this? Are you willing to go back and declare the other House constituted *en permanence*—for life? Are you willing to restore the nominative power to the Crown, or leave it with the district, for which the member may decess? Are you willing to constitute the other House on the principle of equality, if you have your fair, popular representation in this House, which originates the money bills? These, gentlemen, are considerations which must accompany the practical adoption of Representation by Population, and though I blame nobody for recording his vote for an abstract principle,



your question will not be a practical one, till you are prepared to consider it with all its pendants, conditions, and surroundings. (Hear, hear.) I hope to see a party—I hope to see a government who will be so prepared to consider it; and to overhaul our whole constitutional system, or rather no system, for at present we have none. At present, the Act of Union hangs in shreds and tatters on the statute book; 27 out of 62 clauses, with schedules A and B, having been superseded or repealed, by Imperial or Provincial legislation. (Hear, hear.) Thirty-five clauses—and these, except the twelfth, of little importance—are all that remain. It is a disgrace to the intelligence of the House, of the country, and of the age we live in, that such a tattered garment should be all we have to clothe the limbs of this young giant nation. (Hear, hear.) This, Mr. Speaker, is not a subject for heat—not a subject on which it is seemly to talk of bloodshed, on one side or the other. The hon. member for Portneuf, and the hon. member for Laprairie, are ready to shed their blood in resisting Representation by Population; while the hon. member for Peel is prepared to shed his blood to obtain it. I ought to congratulate the House on this increase of the martial spirit (laughter), but I prefer to look at the question from a general point of view, as one might look from the summit of the “Two Mountains” upon the Ottawa river, from which you can see both Upper and Lower Canada at once. (Cheers.)

Besides the considerations affecting the other House, involved in any other fundamental alterations in our own organisation, there will be the consideration of the relation which the Judiciary of Canada are to sustain to the other departments of Government in the new system. In England, it was an ancient constitutional usage for the Sovereign, or both Houses, to submit queries on constitutional subjects to the Judges; but the legislative bodies have not hesitated at times to vote the answers of the Judges “insufficient,” and to affirm other principles, in resolutions or enactments of their own. In the United States, the Supreme Court has always been an essential department of the Govern-

ment; if we are to frame constitutional changes with a view to permanency, it will be imperative on us to define the relation of the Judges to the Legislature and the Executive. Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the subject of constitutional changes involves another—our relations to the Imperial Government. While I utterly protest against the Imperial Government imposing a ready-made constitution upon us, I know very well that it is not possible, neither is it desirable, that we should enter on the administration of an improved system until the Imperial Government have sanctioned it. (Hear, hear.) Do I think such a new system as I indicated would weaken or destroy the connection with Great Britain? Everything of course would depend on its executive chief; but as one who believes that where circumstances are not forced, as much legal liberty may be enjoyed with an hereditary as with an elective chief; as one who has no prejudices against a constitutional monarchy, really founded upon, and therefore subject to, the fundamental law; as one holding these general views, I should be prepared to see the connection strengthened at this side by a vice-royalty, which should become a *secundo geniture* in Her Majesty's family, and give the possessor rank immediately after the heir-apparent. (Hear, hear.) I throw out this view with great deference, as a long-entertained idea, rather than a complete conviction; but I throw it out for the consideration of those who are groundlessly alarmed, that the very discussion of constitutional changes threatens the connection. On the contrary, it seems to me, in the adoption of a permanent and comprehensive system, the Imperial bond, if so desired on both sides, might be imbedded and preserved for ages. (Hear, hear.) Another guarantee of that description would be a Colonial representation in the Imperial Parliament; a reform in the metropolitan constitution, long foreseen and foreshown by many able men, both British and foreign, among whom I may mention the name of Dr. Francis Lieber, in his admirable history of "Civil Liberty and Self-Government." (Hear.) But whatever may be the precise distribution of powers, I shall always maintain, Mr. Speaker, that such a

constitution should originate among ourselves (hear, hear); that it should spring from the *sensus communis* of Canada, and the other Provinces, if they coalesce; that it should be the product of the best heads, both in and out of political life, in these colonies; that it should not be imposed upon us as a mere Imperial edict by the Minister of the day in Downing Street, though I cheerfully admit we must go to Downing Street for its final sanction. (Cheers.) With these guarantees—an equality secured to territory in the Upper House—above all, with the Imperial indorsement on its back, it is necessary to suppose one of two things before we can dream of the violation of such a compact. Either Lower or Upper Canada should conspire in secret and revolt, or the Imperial power should join one or other to oppress one or the other. (Hear, hear.) For your religious guarantee, gentlemen of Lower Canada, insert in such an instrument, so sanctioned, the very words of the capitulation of Quebec, and so long as you are a million strong—100,000 fighting men with the free use of arms—you may laugh to scorn any violence to your institutions, even if any one were mad enough and wicked enough to attempt such violence. (Cheers.) I submit, Mr. Speaker, that I have indicated sufficiently my own objections to any unconsidered and unqualified change, without taking up the whole system and viewing it in all its parts. I am not opposed—I am in favour of the representation of the tax-paying many in this House, which votes and disposes of those taxes; but I am against piecemeal legislation, on the frame of the Government itself. If the old house will not stand, let us take it down and erect a new one, according to our enlarged means and increased family. But the word *dissolution—divorce*—what the old Jurists called *separatismus*—ought never to be heard in this House. (Hear, hear.) Another term of almost equally evil import is that too often heard in this debate, “my section of the country.” We have nothing to do with sections here; we are the Commons of Canada. Sir, perhaps I am in a too sanguine mood of the triumph of what I believe to be the right principles, but though they are thus wrangling for recog-

dition, there are three things I do not despair of: I do not despair of the adoption of the principle of numbers as the basis of representation in the popular branch of the future Parliament of Canada; I do not despair of this principle being engrafted in a new Constitutional Act, or *Magna Charta*, which shall be in great part framed by our leading spirits, which Act shall be entirely assented to by the large majority of the people of Lower Canada; nor do I despair of seeing under this generous, wise, and tolerant constitution, the admission, if not at the outset, then at some future day, of the other British North American Provinces. (Hear, hear.) I shall vote, Sir, for both amendments, though I much prefer that of my hon. friend, the member for Montreal. As, however, the amendment of the hon. member for Cornwall does not pretend to lay down the "Double Majority" as a rule or principle, but simply declares it "highly desirable," with our present imperfect system, that the actual Government should not be carried on without a majority in both sections, I intend to vote for that also; no doubt it is "highly desirable while the present system continues." (Cheers.)

## CONSTITUTIONAL DIFFICULTIES BETWEEN UPPER AND LOWER CANADA.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, AT QUEBEC, APRIL 17TH, 1861.

AFTER some introductory remarks, Mr. McGEE said :—  
I proceed now to the general question—Shall we, or shall we not, have such constitutional changes as our present circumstances, our twenty years' experience of Responsible Government, and a majority of our fellow-subjects, demand at our hands? (Hear, hear.) The arguments addressed to this House in favour of maintaining things as they are, by the three Cabinet Ministers from Lower Canada having seats in this House, and by several members, their partisans, (who may be called the buttresses of the Administration joined to it and supporting it from without,) were mainly three: 1. The example of Great Britain, of whose institutions ours were said to be a transcript: 2. The recent sad experience of the United States—held up to us for our warning: 3. The determination of French Canadians never to entertain at any future time, near or distant, the question of readjusting the popular representation in this House. I think these three heads include all the argument or show of argument that was made on the other side, and when I examine the two former—the American and British precedents—I shall feel free to discuss the consequences of the utterly impracticable policy foreshadowed in the ultimatum of "things as they are" for another ten years. (Hear, hear.) I deny, Sir, at the outset with the member for South Ontario, that our system can be considered a transcript of the British Constitution. Where is the resemblance—not to say identity? England has three "estates"—a Sovereign and two Houses; and we have

three branches of Legislature, a Governor and two Chambers. But France, and Prussia, and Belgium, and the United States, have also two Chambers and an Executive, or Sovereign. If we look below the surface we will find that in the present distribution of our powers, we depart almost as widely from the British system, in several important particulars, as the United States, or some others of the countries just named. In the Constitutional Act of 1791, and even in the Act of Union, the distribution of powers was essentially different from what it is now. Then, the Governor-General had a judicial function as part of the Court of Appeals—now he has no judicial function; then the Upper House was nominative and might have been hereditary, now it is elective and ephemeral; then there was legal provision made for the maintenance of the Church of England, now you have a Statute, ratified by an Imperial Act, declaring it to be essential to abolish "the very semblance of the connection between Church and State." Without judicial powers in your Executive, without an ecclesiastical, judicial, or hereditary element in your Upper House, where is the much-talked-of transcript of the British Constitution? In the powers and functions of this House, we might, indeed, find a close resemblance to the composition of the British House of Commons, if it were not for the 12th section of the Act of Union, which is the real basis of this House; the clause decreeing equality of representation to the two former Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada. Is it not this clause, by your own showing, that gives a federative character to this assembly; and where, let me ask, can you show a federative clause in the Reform Bill of 1832, in the Bill of Rights, or the Acts of Union with Ireland or Scotland—or in any other fundamental law of England, defining the character of their House of Commons? No such provision exists, and consequently each of our three branches of the Legislature contains within it principles, or modifications of principles, absolutely unknown to the British system. (Hear, hear.) The British system, Mr. Speaker, as a very cursory acquaintance with its history shows, was originally

constructed on the principle of a domestic balance of power, and although it has undergone important modifications, it has never wholly lost its original character. In its first stages, the balance was between the Clergy and Nobles—"the spirituality and the temporality," as they were anciently called. A radical innovation was made by the great partisan leader Simon de Montfort, now better known as a soldier than a statesman, when he introduced the representation of borough towns. Before his day the tenants holding in *capita*, and by knights' service in the counties, looked with the same indifference on the claims of the mere mechanics of the towns, that the hon. gentleman does on the majority of Upper Canada; but when de Montfort's reform began to take effect on the system, especially after the Reformation had displaced the clerical equipoise, the balance was formed by the town and country party—and that continued to be the case till the Reform Bill of 1832, and still, in part, continues. In England this offsetting of interests and classes was possible, for the soil of England was held by feudal tenure, and so early as the reign of the first Stuart, 8000 towns could be counted within the kingdom. In England, as Romilly said of India, "distinctions of class are religiously preserved;" in England there are estates of the Crown, of the Peerage, and of the Commons; but in Canada we have nothing of the kind. In Canada we have been obliged to extinguish the only feudal tenure which remained on the Continent, and to substitute for it, the tenure of "free and common soccage"—the universal tenure of the British American Colonies, a tenure fatal to the growth of sustenance of a landed aristocracy. I freely admit, therefore, with all the hon. gentlemen who have made that assertion, that the British system is not now and never was founded on the basis of numbers alone; but at the same time I assert, we never had a close copy of that system, and that every year since the Union we have been departing, under the pressure of circumstances, more and more from the general resemblance which our Constitutional Acts once bore to that original. But, Sir, I might go even farther

than this—I might assert with truth, that for the last half century and upwards, much of the best intellect of England has been devoted to equalising the representation of the people in the Commons House of Parliament. What was the method pursued by Earl Grey's administration when they brought in their Reform Bill in 1832? They employed Lieut. Drummond, an expert at calculations, to classify the towns and counties of England into five classes or schedules, in proportion to their population and taxation. Lieut. Drummond's decimal tables were a main point of attack by the Disraeli of that day—Mr. John Wilson Croker. Every advocate of the bill defended their accuracy; and upon the basis of those calculations the Reform was carried, and the Representation still stands. Why were St. Michael's, and St. Mawes, Gatton, and Old Sarum disfranchised? Why were Manchester and Leeds enfranchised? Because the former were dispeopled, and the latter were populous towns; and was not that a long stride towards the representation of members? This is a very slight sketch of the history of the latest British reform: before, however, I pass away from it, I beg to observe, in answer to what fell from the Hon. Provincial Secretary and other gentlemen, who referred to the unequal representation of Ireland in the Imperial Parliament, that the Irish liberal or patriotic party have always considered that inequality a flagrant injustice. The Hon. Secretary alluded to Mr. O'Connell on this point, and was glad to find that I considered him a greater authority now than when he was living. Sir, I had the honour to know him slightly in his latter days, and the misfortune to differ from that illustrious man, to whose memory I may be permitted to render the homage of my more mature judgment. It has been my lot, Sir, to have seen many and to have known a few, a very few, historical persons, but I can truly say that, apart from the exaggeration of native patriotism, I never approached a person who seemed more truly deserving the title of "great" than Mr. O'Connell. When I consider his exclusively Gaelic origin, his provincial birth, his proscribed creed, his foreign education; when I con-



sider that the English tongue, destined to be his sole arsenal, equipment, and resource, was neither the language of his childhood in Kerry, nor of his studies in France; when I consider all the foes he overcame within and without; when I remember that he entered the Imperial Parliament for the first time at the age of 54; and the position he made and held till the last in that fastidious assembly; I feel that I do not place him too highly, when I claim that he should be ranked among the most original politicians of modern times. (Hear, hear.) Well, Sir, on this very subject before us what was Mr. O'Connell's standing complaint?—"The county of Cork has 880,000 inhabitants, and (with her boroughs) six members; the principality of Wales has some 900,000 inhabitants, and yet Wales has 29 members! Is this justice to Ireland, is this a union which should be upheld by Irishmen?" Such were the arguments of that great popular leader, and such was the doctrine of all the Irish liberal party—a school to which, in some things, though not in all things, I am as proud to declare my adhesion to-day as I was in the earlier and more enthusiastic years of my life. (Hear, hear.) The recent sad experience of the United States has been frequently held up to us as a warning against extending the power of the people in this House, during this debate. Every one of the gentlemen who so admonished us assumed one and the same case—the excess of the democratic element in that constitution as the origin of its disruption. Mr. Speaker, I sympathise deeply with the proud and sensitive American people, who, for the first time within living memory, are doomed to hear their country spoken of in accents of pity. I sympathise with them, and with human nature deeply concerned in the issue of the American experiment; but I maintain that it is our duty in the presence of such events as are now unfortunately occurring in the United States, not to volunteer our testimony on slight or insufficient grounds against man's capacity for self-government in the New World (hear, hear), not to attempt to wring a distorted moral, unfavourable to human rights, from a hurried survey of the facts. (Hear, hear.)

Next to the people of the Free States, we ourselves possess the largest powers of self-government wielded anywhere on this continent, and we ought to be bailsmen with them for our common liberties, derived from a common root, rather than witnesses against them. (Cries of "hear, hear.") But as the instance of the United States has been adduced, let me ask directly, does any one pretend to say that it was, mainly or solely, through default of the House of Representatives, which is based strictly on Representation by Population, that the Union fell? (Hear, hear.) The Senate is constructed on quite another basis,—on the basis of State equality; yet every one knows that in the Senate the discussion mainly raged since the early days of Mr. Calhoun, June, 1820, downwards. ~~It was~~ was in the Senate Webster encountered Hayne, and Douglass, Benton; and Seward, Hunter; and it was in the Senate, Sumner was stricken down by brute force for his assaults on Slavery. (Hear, hear.) It was not through the popular branch that the core of the constitution was wounded beyond cure, if it has been wounded. What then becomes of your argument, *à propos* of nothing? Oh! it was because the President's Cabinet did not sit in the House, and were not responsible directly to the Legislature; that the system broke up! Well, suppose we grant this other assumption, who proposes here to lessen the responsibility of our Ministers, or to exclude them from this House? No one proposes anything of the kind; let us not evade the question under consideration, by arguing against a proposition which is not before us. If we are to profit by American experience, it can only be by taking into view all the recent facts of their political history, the numerical increase of the slaves, the territorial increase of the Southern States, the annexation of Texas, the war with Mexico, the conquest of California, that fatal success which has brought the trial of sudden riches, hard to be borne by man or nation, in its train. Then there were other internal reasons besides this sudden overgrowth. There was the States Right doctrine of Mr. Calhoun and his school, which taught the seductive theory to Southern men that the essentials of sovereignty remained with the States,

and never were ceded to the Union ; then there was a political pulpit and an agitating clergy, confounding the Sabbath with the week and theology with politics ; then there was a brilliant but reckless press sneering daily at the " Union-savers "—a press before whose arrows of ridicule, barbed by wit but feathered by folly, the ancient sentiment of veneration for the work of Washington and his colleagues fell to the earth. (Hear, hear.) These influences—but most of all the numerical increase of the slaves, the unjustly acquired spoils of the Spanish-Americans—must all be taken into the account when we presume to sit in judgment on the events we have lived to witness at Washington ; and we should be most careful not to overstate the case against popular institutions, which our own resemble in structure (though not in administration) quite as nearly as they resemble those of Great Britain. (Hear, hear.) I come now, Sir, after these excursions across the line and across the ocean, to our own constitutional condition, the immediate subject of this debate. I intend to vote against the consideration of this Bill, as I voted against similar Bills and resolutions when introduced by the hon. members for Toronto, Lambton, and Victoria. I never will vote, as I never have voted, for the introduction of such a principle into our system alone, unqualified, unchecked, unbalanced. (Hear, hear.) Hon. gentlemen opposite have again in this debate sneered at their own science, or what ought to be their own science, constitutional checks, balances, and guarantees. Yet I ask them, or any of them, from their confident leader downwards, to point me out a single constitutional statesman or writer, European or American, who has ever been able to discuss this subject, or define this system, without the employment of such terms. (Hear, hear.) I presume no one will deny that Lord Brougham may be considered an authority on the British Constitution, and Mr. Webster on the American. Well, in what terms do these distinguished men speak of their several systems ? Mr. Webster, in his celebrated speech in reply to Hayne, delivered in the Senate of the United States, in 1850, says :—" I admit, Sir, that this Government is a Govern-

ment of checks and balances; that is, the House of Representatives is a check on the Senate, and the Senate is a check on the House, and the President is a check on both." (Hear, hear.) The 2nd chapter of the second volume of Lord Brougham's "Political Philosophy," entitled "Of Balances and Checks," is devoted to prove that no constitutional system can exist without these conditions, *perfect* or *imperfect*. After referring to the constitutions of Athens and Rome, he goes on to say that "a much more striking exemplification of the doctrine," of checks and balances, "is to be found in the English Constitution." After giving some particular recent instances of this description, he proceeds to lay down the general rule in words, with which I shall trouble the House:—"In all these instances," says Lord Brougham, "whether of contending parties or conflicting authorities in the State, the different forces combine to produce the result, the movement of the machine. Its course is in the direction neither of the one force nor of the other, but in a direction between those which either would separately have made it take. As a body on which two forces operate at the same time, in different but not in opposite directions, moves in the diagonal between the two directions, so does the Legislature or the Government of a country take the middle course between the two which the different authorities or influences would make it take if left to itself. It will depend upon *the proportion of the forces to each other*, whether the direction taken shall incline more to the one than to the other; but this affects not the argument, the course is affected by each, and *the influence of each prevails as a check on the other*." I dare to quote Mr. Webster even against so profound a sage as the hon. member for Arthabaska (laughter); I venture to quote Lord Brougham against the Hon. Attorney-General. (Laughter.) And by-and-by, Sir, I may have to quote Archdeacon Paley against the hon. and rev. member for South Lanark (laughter), and Mr. Justice Blackstone against the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. (Laughter.) In one respect it is consistent enough in the hon. gentleman to sneer at "checks" and "balances," in

the face of all constitutional authority, because their own policy has never been regulated by any such constitutional rules or forces. They have been instrumental as principals or assistants in sweeping away 28 of the 62 clauses of the Act of Union, and yet they plead the remaining fragment as an inviolable compact. They have left our present division of powers between the two Houses, and the internal organisation of each House, at the haphazard of a single vote—an absolute majority of one. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. CAUCHON—No, no!

Mr. McGEE—If the hon. gentleman consults the Statutes he will find it as I say.—They created an elective Legislative Council, and they have never till this day defined its functions, so that no one either in this House or in the other can describe its proper place in the present contrivance, which serves us instead of a constitution. Have they not argued here last night, and sealed their arguments with their votes, that it is not necessary for an adviser of the Crown to possess the confidence of the people? (Hear, hear.) I can well understand why persons capable of such public conduct should find checks full of painful restraint, balances irksome in operation, and guarantees impossible of observance. When I advocate a more measured distinction of the powers of the Government, I advocate it not for them but for the peace of the country, the unity of all its inhabitants, and for the direction and protection of those who may be the future rulers of the Province. (Hear, hear.) Though I intend, Mr. Speaker, to vote against the introduction of the Bill, I do not intend to meet its many able and respectable advocates on this side of the House and on the other with a flat denial, still less with odious comparisons and irritating taunts. *I concede to them frankly that constitutional changes are necessary, and must come sooner or later.* But I go further; I believe that such changes should be made with a view to permanence, and should embrace simultaneously the division of powers between this House and the other, the limits of the Executive; the power, and real responsibility of Ministers, and the recognition of some judicial tribunal as

the final interpreter of our constitutional compact or fundamental law. I will endeavour to exhibit my meaning, as briefly as possible, under the several heads of the Executive, the Upper House, Ministerial Responsibility, the Composition of this House, and the functions of Final Interpreter, under such a reformed constitution as I am prepared to discuss and to help forward, in common with all who are convinced of its necessity, whether they come from Upper or Lower Canada. Before I go into this detail, Mr. Speaker, it may not be amiss to say another word or two on the general subject, the division of powers and the system of checks, which Dr. Paley calls "the first maxim of a free State," and which Blackstone calls "a main preservative of the public liberty."—The same may be said to be the all but unanimous verdict of all the authors whose works are of authority on the subject of government; in fact, this doctrine of the distribution of powers is as cardinal with constitutional writers as the doctrine of the division of labour is with the economists. (Hear, hear.) To begin at the head. Are the duties and powers of the Executive in any of these North American colonies—or, for our present purposes, speaking only of ourselves—as well settled, as well understood, as indisputable, as the duties of the Sovereign are in England?—Has not every Governor who has been here, since the establishment of Responsible Government, been accused of violating that system? (Hear, hear.) Has not every representative of the Crown, during those twenty years, been accused of transgressing his limits, and been hooted in the streets of the seat of Government? Has not the remedy of electing our own Governors been advocated by many influential persons? Has not a "written constitution" been thought by others the only protection against the abuses alleged against the representatives of the Crown in Canada? (Hear, hear.) Have there not been hints and murmurs about a renewal of the scenes of 1837-38? Whence the reason? Have all our Governors been to blame, or has not the indefinite nature of their powers been a main cause of all this unpopularity? The truth seems to me to be that the

Governors' powers were settled by the Act of Union, and unsettled by Mr. Baldwin's subsequent resolutions laying down the doctrine of the Executive Council's responsibility to this Chamber. Nothing can show more clearly the responsibility of the Governor as an Imperial office to the Crown, and that of his Provincial advisers to this House, than the two conflicting despatches addressed on those subjects to Lord Sydenham by Lord John Russell, in October, 1839. (Hear.) Both despatches may be considered hostile to the theory of Responsible Government, though in very different degrees, and it is equally certain from Lord Sydenham's memoirs and letters, that the Act of Union was framed in the same spirit of hostility. Your first innovation that the Act was to make the Governor subject, in the selection of this Council, to the majority of this House,—a salutary innovation, I admit, but still no part of the fundamental law; affirmed only by a resolution of this House, and which a strong man, a vain man, or an irritable man, holding the office, might and could evade by shuffling expedients, such as refusing one party a dissolution and granting it to another, or by sanctioning such an evasion of the independence of Parliament Act as was sanctioned at Toronto, in July, 1858. Another innovation on the Governor's powers I have already alluded to, when you struck him out of the composition of the Court of Appeals, and left him no remnant of judicial authority, except the pardoning power may be so considered. I do not complain that our chief rulers appear on closer examination, that they have still quite enough for the efficiency of their office; I do not complain that their term of office is not fixed; but I do think it would be equally desirable for the future incumbents of that high office, as well as for their councillors and the people of this country, that these powers of the Executive should be, by common consent, defined and established, so that the riotous discontents of the past might never again disgrace our cities or our records. (Hear, hear.) For it seems to me that if you wish to give the Sovereign's representative here a chance to be as popular as the Sovereign's self in England, give his autho-

rity its full legitimate scope within the constitution; let him know his place; let us know it; let the people know it, and then the experiments of the Metcalfs and the Elgins on Canadian endurance, and the deplorable events they led to, will be impossible of repetition in the future.—(Cries of hear.) I come now, Sir, to the composition of the Upper House, and I repeat my former question; can any one in this chamber or in that, tell me what the powers of our Senate are? Can they vote confidence or want of confidence in the Ministry of the day? Can they alter or originate a money bill? We vote the people's taxes, because, on the British maxim, we come from the people—because, as the hon. member for Arthabaska said the other night—"the Commons are on the floor of this House." But do they not also come from the people? Are they, either as persons or as an assembly, a privileged order? The only privileges I know appertaining to them is, that they are not subject to dissolution before their time, as we are. But does this indissolubility alone constitute them an effective check on this House? Does it establish any other function in them, than the faculty of inertia? Is it anything better in itself, than a premium for indifference—than a bonus on indolence? Men of active mind going into that Chamber may busy themselves in amateur legislation for a session or two, but when they find they have no real power, either with the Executive or with this House, they will soon grow weary,

———"Of dropping buckets into empty wells,  
And growing old in drawing nothing up."

Sir, I would give the Upper House real importance by giving it active duties; I would have it constituted on a basis as unlike ours as possible; I would have it the representative of age, property, and all our conservative influence; and I would besides make it the Court of Impeachment, before which all high crimes against the Constitution should be tried. (Hear, hear.) And this mention of the word *impeachment* brings me, Mr. Speaker,



to another matter—our present notions of ministerial responsibility to the people. We hear commonly a great deal of ministerial responsibility to the people, that is, to this House; that a majority can always turn them out of office, and so forth.

Attorney-General MACDONALD—Is it not so?

Mr. McGEE—Practically, where has been the proof of such vaunted responsibility? (Hear, hear.) Give a ministry the power of augmenting the public debt at discretion, and obtaining by the lavish expenditure of the people's money a corrupt majority in this House, and they may defy, and have defied, public opinion from one general election till another! Give them the power of retaining their seats by a narrow majority, made up wholly of their own votes, and where is the responsibility? We saw an instance of it last night. Convict one or all of them of a corrupt use of their position as advisers of the Crown—they resign, and where is the responsibility? Oh! true, you may cite them before a court of justice; you or I, or any private citizen may. That was the retort to the charges concerning the Sarnia land sale; that was the course taken by Mr. M'Donnell, a citizen of Toronto, after the double shuffle. But I maintain that, according to all constitutional precedent, an offence against the State ought to be prosecuted by and in behalf of the State; that the high criminals ought to be tried before one of the bodies of the magistracy, who partake both of legislative, and in that respect, of judicial functions; and I go farther, and assert that there never has been a salutary form of constitution which did not provide for the public punishment, on behalf of the State, of corrupt ministers and other executive officers. In England not only the ordinary advisers of the Crown are subject to such impeachment, but the Lord Chancellor may be impeached for attaching the great seal to an ignominious treaty; an Admiral may be impeached for neglecting the defence of the narrow seas; an Ambassador for having betrayed his trust; a Judge for receiving a bribe, or a Privy Councillor for propounding pernicious advice to his Sovereign. No portion of their history is better known to

English politicians than their "State Trials," and though the comparative calm of recent times has called for few impeachments, they know well that the block and the headsman's axe have not been removed from the ramparts of the Constitution. Those who are for ever asserting that our system is a transcript of the British ought to know that, in this important particular, the copy has not been truly made; that this House cannot arraign, nor the other House hear, nor the Judges act as assessors, nor the Governor-General preside at the trial of any guilty minister or peccant judge in this province; that in office you cannot reach them; that out of office you cannot pursue them; that we stand before the world in the anomalous position of having provided ample penalties for every breach of trust which is a public wrong, except the very highest of all, for which we have no penalty and no tribunal. (Hear, hear.) The thief who puts his hand into his master's till is rightly punished; but the thief who thrusts his arm to the elbow into the public Treasury "resigns," to re-appear, after a season, on the public stage, or to enjoy unmolested his ease and dignity. (Hear, hear.) Sir—and I must beg the forbearance of the House a little longer, while I discuss the constitution of this House—I have always been of opinion—in Ireland, in the United States, in Canada—that the popular branch of every legislative body should fully represent the numbers of the population. (Hear, hear.) I for one am not frightened at the bugbear of universal suffrage, though I am well content with our present standard, which may be termed universal suffrage for married men. If the population of Upper Canada should be shown by the census to be 250,000 more than that of Lower Canada, and notwithstanding all the arrangements made under various pressures and pretexts at "the Union," these quarter of a million out of two millions and a half—one-tenth of our total numbers—demand an increased representation on this floor, in my humble opinion the way to meet such a demand is not by a flat denial, but by an alternative proposition, to which both sections may in the end be reconciled. Can any such proposition be made by

Lower Canada? (Hear.) That is the great question which the bill before the House calls on us to revolve within ourselves. The Premier says "No," and menaces us with a war of race. The hon. member for Montmorenci refuses even to debate it—moves "the six months' hoist." My hon. friends from Montreal and Iberville, and I hope I may add my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe, do not despair of a remedy; they are at all events quite willing to hear other opinions and to offer their own when the question comes up in a practical shape. I agree with those who hold that we can find an alternative proposition other than by repealing the Union, which would be a release but no remedy. And I will put a supposititious case to those hon. gentlemen who deny the possibility of establishing any efficient checks against oppression in our circumstances. It is this:—Suppose you had guarantees for the fullest religious and civil freedom in your fundamental law, framed by yourselves, and ratified by Her Majesty for herself and her successors! Suppose you had a guarantee in the composition of the Upper House; suppose you had a power of final interpretation in cases of doubt arising under the constitution, composed of an equal number of the judges of Upper and Lower Canada; would all these guarantees, involving the good faith of the Sovereign and of her representative, the good faith of the Upper House, and the high Judiciary, would all these content you?

Hon. Mr. CAUCHON—No.

Mr. McGEE—I believe there is but one voice in this House says "No." Such guarantees could be had both from England and from Upper Canada; the interests of the Empire, the interests of the public creditor, the interests of Upper Canada herself, would all be favourable to such a settlement, and if Lower Canada is wise in season she will neither despise such terms nor insult those who respectfully submit them for her consideration. To those who threaten a war of race, I say solemnly—Beware! (Hear, hear.) We have pretty well extinguished the war of creeds, and we are not likely to permit ourselves, I hope, to be embattled, like the Knights of Rhodes, by languages and nationalities.

What must we think of the sanity, not to say the wisdom, of any minister who could utter such a menace against the English-speaking population, two-thirds of the whole people of this dependency of England? That English-speaking population is a slow match, as hard to kindle as to extinguish, and to those who address it in the language of menace, I say again—Beware! (Hear, hear.) Far better and worthier of the hon. gentleman's position would it be to avail himself of his majority to propose an alternative to the people of Upper Canada than to force them into one united phalanx, as his devoted follower for the last seven years, the member for Durham, told him the other night he would do. "A time of peace is the time for reforms," says a great political authority, and it will be far easier to adjust our mutual difficulties now, than to let the old constitution run on into downright political bankruptcy. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that, by postponing the day of reckoning, he can diminish the demands on either side, or lessen the pangs of concession on either? Is his best preparative for a friendly settlement to be found in a long cherished previous hostility? Will his own usefulness as a pacificator be improved by his haughty tone in the present debate?—Far from it. (Hear, hear.) He may win the applause of the unthinking; he may strengthen himself by such language with a section or a faction, but he never can become, by indulging in that spirit, a statesman for the whole country. (Cheers.) Another word only I will add—to every man who values our provincial union, peace, and prosperity—and that is, that there is no time like the present in which to enter on the great, good work of constitutional amendment. To those who would attract new strength from abroad; to those who would contrast our stability with America's agitation; to those who desire the principles of constitutional monarchy to have a fair trial in this new field; to those cooler spirits who look beyond the hour, and know a duty in the distance as well as when they can touch it with their right hands,—to all and every one of these classes I say use your time, and correct by the high light of experience the errors and

aberrations of your constitution. Let such as have faith in a war of creeds; let such as have faith in a war of races, take their stand—the sooner the better; but let all just men who have seen and felt the derangement of our whole existing system, who have thought and compared thoughts as to the remedies to be applied; let them be but true to themselves and their convictions, and I am persuaded a solution will yet be found satisfactory to all reasonable men both in Upper and Lower Canada. (Loud cheers.)

## CANADIAN DEFENCES.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, QUEBEC, MARCH 27TH, 1862. A DUTIFUL ADDRESS  
IN REPLY TO THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE HAVING BEEN MOVED.

MR. MCGEE addressed Mr. Speaker as follows:—A speech from the Throne may be open to criticism for what it omits, as well as for what it contains, and I cannot, for my own part, avoid saying that I think the gratifying results of the late decennial Census, and the subject of emigration and the settlement of the country, ought to have been referred to. The Census is an event of rare occurrence; it is an act of the highest importance; its results stated in the Royal Speech would have circulated farther and with higher authenticity than when put forward in any other manner. I think, therefore, it should have been referred to, and that the subject of Emigration was also, just at this period, of such importance as not to have been omitted. The leading English journal lately uttered a sentiment on this head with which I entirely concur, when it said that if our statesmen were worthy of their position, "America's difficulty might be made Canada's opportunity." No other subject has occupied a larger space in the provincial press—the press of all parties—than this of emigration, and the hands of our provincial agents abroad would have been much strengthened by such an authority. We have only to hope that during the session it may command more attention in this House than it has done from the framers of the Speech from the Throne. (Hear, hear.) Of the first sentences, Mr. Speaker—I mean the very proper reference to the late Prince Consort in the Speech—there has not been, and there could not be, any difference of opinion in this House. All parties are

equally agreed in Canada, that the world has lost a finished man in the Prince Consort—a man whose memory is less to be honoured for his good fortune and alliances than for his provident use of his time, the elevation of his tastes, and the conspicuous example of his private life. To those sentences we all cordially subscribe, and we are all indebted to His Excellency for having given us an opportunity of joining with him in the just and feeling tribute he has paid to the character of the deceased Prince. Immediately following this allusion to Prince Albert there is a paragraph on which I propose, Mr. Speaker, to make some observations to the House, coupling it, however, with the last paragraph specially addressed to this House—I mean that concerning our Colonial defences. The first mentioned paragraph alludes to Her Majesty's gracious recognition of the attachment exhibited by all classes in this Province, in the late emergency,\* towards the mother country, and I feel that it is no forced march to take up in connection with that passage the relative one of how far this Province ought to look to the metropolitan power for its external defence, or for any species of military protection whatever. (Hear, hear.) I must say, Sir, with all deference, but with all emphasis, that we in Canada cannot but think that the time chosen by the anti-Colonial party in England for the declaration of their principles, exceedingly ill chosen, and the manner of some among them exceedingly injurious to Canadian feeling. If they were really the people of England—if they were likely to direct at any future day the Government of England,—it would be incumbent on us here, without the loss of a single day, to look around us, in search of some new state of political existence. What, Sir! when all ranks and classes with us have been vying with each other as to who should do most to give volunteer defenders to the country, was this a time to read us an economical lecture on the burthensome nature of our allegiance to the Empire? Was this a time to have it proclaimed in Washington by the authority of the Imperial

\* The affair of the *Trent*.

Parliament, that that supreme assembly considered us too dear a bargain at 2,000,000*l.* a-year. (Hear, hear.) It is undeniable, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that we are indebted for this rebuff, and the Americans for this gratification, to that school of economists who bring every subject of Government to the infallible test of pounds, shillings, and pence. With that school it is, perhaps, presumptuous to reason, but this I venture to assert, that if their doctrine of putting every Imperial relation in the scales of a cash balance should ever prevail, the British Empire will be near its end, not only in North America, but in the British Islands. (Hear, hear.) These gentlemen of England argue that this country is no commercial benefit to England, because it is of no apparent profit to her. But supposing even this argument to be unanswerably true—though I am far from allowing it to be so—are there no relations any longer profitable or desirable between the mother country and her colonies but commercial relations? Are there no political ties? Are there no military advantages as well as disadvantages attached to colonies? I am not competent to judge whether the military conveniences or inconveniences of holding Canada as a base of North American operations may preponderate in the minds of British military men, but it is clear so far that they have not pronounced against retaining the military power on our soil. It is so far an outcry of civilians and politicians, and it may therefore be answered by other civilians. Now it seems to me, Sir, that both in England and with us much confusion arises from substituting England, or “the mother country,” for the Empire at large, in certain stages of the argument, and dropping that substitution at other stages. Thus we hear people talk of the Empire and the Colonies, as if the Colonies were something apart, exclusive, external to Empire. This is an evident fallacy; we, here in Quebec, are at this moment as strictly an Imperial city as London or Dublin. Her Majesty’s subject in Windsor, Canada West, stands as near to Her Majesty, politically, as Her Majesty’s subject in Windsor, County of Berkshire. (Cheers.) The reciprocal duties of subject and Sovereign are not attenuated



by distance, but, on the contrary, are oftener enhanced, since they are cherished against the relaxing influence of such distance. Those who talk, therefore, of it being unreasonable to expect the Empire to defend Canada, forget that Canada is itself the Empire in North America. The Empire, commonly called British, is an Asiatic Empire in virtue of India, an Australian Empire in virtue of Australia, an African Empire in virtue of the Cape and other possessions; and it is an American Empire still, in virtue of our sister Provinces and ourselves. Is it the will and wish of the English in England to have no longer fellow-subjects in North America? For it must come to that—whenever the Empire in Canada is not to be defended by all the vigilance and all the resources of the entire Empire, whenever its existence comes to be considered in the metropolis as something separate and apart from their own existence. If that undesirable change should come to pass, future British Ministers at Washington will be much less harassed with work than Lord Lyons, because they will be much less influential; they will have fewer cares, but they will also have a lower sphere of action. Why are Her Majesty's representatives on the Potomac *facile princeps* of all the diplomatic body? Why is the British Minister, next to the President, the second power at Washington? Not alone because of England's greatness proper to herself, but because he alone represents a North American power—if we except the Russian representatives of the Czar's provinces in the North Pacific, which certainly give a proportionate influence to Russia. If Lord Lyons could review Mr. Seward, with his hand resting on the breach of the Armstrong gun that thrills this whole region from the Citadel, he could not more visibly and personally have Canada and Quebec at his back than he has already in the mind's eye of the statesman of the Federal Union. (Cheers.) No, Mr. Speaker; directly the commerce of Canada may no longer be an object to the manufacturers, but indirectly, and politically, every English relation with every part of America must already depend materially on the fact, whether or not the Crown of England is still one of the

largest proprietors on this continent. I object, therefore, not only to the confused way in which the terms Empire and Colony are bandied about, but I also object to the time chosen by the anti-colonial party in England for raising the question of what we are worth to the rest of the Empire. And I hope, Sir, that from every side, of this House, from every person of influence within these walls, ministerialist as well as oppositionist, that one unanimous protest will go forth in this discussion against the time chosen by the anti-colonial party in England, for raising such an issue with Canada. (Hear, hear.) With a new state of facts all over North America—with half a million men under arms, in our near neighbourhood; with evidence before us of the employment of secret agents of the United States in Canada—was this a time to cast a damper upon the ardour of Colonial loyalty, and to give a new hope of spoliation to our irritated neighbours? Mr. Speaker, a former residence of some years in the United States has given me, I presume to say, some insight into the American character, and consulting that knowledge I do not hesitate to declare that in my opinion we are not yet finally done with the American difficulty. Formerly you had to do with the example and opinions of their democracy, but let Canadians never forget for one hour, that they have now to do with democracy armed and insolent—with democracy in square and column, with a sword by its side and a bitter humiliation in its heart. (Hear, hear.) It is possible, I wish I could say it is probable, that the evil may cure itself through internal purgation; but Canadian vigilance must sleep no more except upon its arms. We have burst into a new era—the halcyon has fled to other climes and latitudes—the storm and peril are daily visible in our horizon. I have no fears for Canada, in the presence even of such a phenomenon as a victorious democratic army, for I believe, after all, the other and elder members of the Empire will stand cordially by us in our day of danger. But they must be prepared to do so, in some fair proportion to their relative strength and wealth as compared with ours, and in proportion to the strength and wealth of the enemy opposed

to us. This is no Cape Colony—this is no Canterbury settlement—and our American neighbours are neither Maoris nor Caffres. It is not against semi-savages, armed only with lances or small arms, that we must keep our frontier, and the frontier of the Empire, but against a people as well armed, as enterprising, and ten times as numerous as ourselves. I admit we must do our share—willingly, cheerfully, and to the utmost extent of our young resources; but I say still, that our share must be proportionate to that of the Empire. (Hear, hear.) To ask us to be the principals in our own defence—in our present stage of development—with our six or seven inhabitants to the square mile—with our three against twenty-five millions—is to ask a downright impossibility. The proportion we should bear to the Empire may, perhaps, be indicated by our mutual symbols of the Lion and the Beaver. There is great disparity between those creatures; the beaver, it is true, can work in land and water, and the beaver has worked wonders in the wilderness. But the lion must bear the lion's share, if he would continue lord of the forest he must be sometimes felt—at least his formidable points must be visible to the eye of every American emissary. To drop all metaphor, Mr. Speaker, and speaking only for myself, I declare my perfect readiness to entertain any proper project for putting our Canadian Militia on a thoroughly effective footing, as suggested in His Excellency's speech, but I cannot for a moment entertain—and I do not believe any party in this House or country can entertain—the injurious proposition lately affirmed by the House of Commons, which, as amended by Mr. Baxter, clearly intimates that we are hereafter to rely invariably and mainly on ourselves, and only incidentally on the rest of the Empire for the common defence. (Hear, hear.) On this point I trust the whole House can be unanimous as one man. Not to disturb that unanimity in any quarter I pass over some other topics of the Speech at present. It seems to me we ought to have an early and emphatic expression of opinion on this paramount question of colonial defence, and I would not have troubled the House at all to-day but from a strong sense of

what is due to my own constituents, and the country at large. (Cheers.) In the course of the debate there are other topics to which I should wish to speak, but just at present they all dwindle into insignificance in comparison with this, on which I have endeavoured to lay my own views respectfully before the House and the country. (Loud cheers.)\*

\* As the above speech is, but one of a series on the subject, the only record of which, during the Session of 1863, is found in the condensed summary of the *Quebec Morning Chronicle*, it is proper to add the following additional remarks, from another point of view, made in the debate of the 20th August, 1863. He (Mr. McTee) went on to show, from actual facts, the great danger which might at any moment come upon the country from an aggressive movement on the part of the Northern States. He reminded the House that he, for one, was no enemy of the North; that, on the contrary, he was friendly towards the North in their struggle with the South, inasmuch as he believed the Washington Government to be the legitimate Government of the country; but there was no use in endeavouring to hide from ourselves the fact that there was a strongly hostile feeling in the minds of a portion of the American people towards everything British and everything Canadian. He had no doubt, nay, more, he was certain that those who were at the head of affairs in the United States were desirous of avoiding a war with England, and fully realised the dreadful consequences which such a contest would involve; but it should not be forgotten that political demagogues might, in a moment of political excitement, at a Presidential election for instance, bring about a state of things which would plunge us into an armed contest. It was only necessary, as a proof of this kind of danger, to refer to the case of the *Trent*, and look at the public ovations which were accorded to Commodore Wilkes, who was lionised and fêted, merely because he had fired a shot across the bows of a British vessel; and there was no saying when some other boisterous blue-jacket might not, by a similar act, put an end to the peaceful relations at present existing between England and America. Mr. McTee then referred to the extensive armament going on along the American side of our frontier—as for instance the erection of a vast fort and barracks near Rouse's Point, the strengthening of the works at Niagara, and the fort at Mackinaw; and quoted the speeches and state papers of the late Mr. Webster and other leading American statesmen to show that the invasion of Canada by way of Rouse's Point was a favourite scheme with many of their leading public men; and that the absorption of the whole continent by the American Republic was the darling object of their ruling public. In conclusion, Mr. McTee dwelt on the willingness which the mother-country had shown, in the hour of danger, to defend her British North American possessions. But while it was well known that England would spend her last man and her last shilling in defence of her Colonies, if the latter showed that they were really desirous of maintaining the connection,—at the same time it was incumbent upon Canadians to provide to the fullest extent of their means for their own protection against insult and aggression."

## REPRESENTATION BY POPULATION.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, QUEBEC, APRIL 1ST, 1862.

MR. MCGEE:—Whenever there was a hair to split the hon. member (Mr. Dunkin) never failed to have his razor at hand. (Laughter.) But such was not the spirit in which a grave reality like this ought to be dealt with, and any man who could descend to sophistry in such circumstances, was wholly misplaced in this House. (Hear, hear.) All that he had ever read or heard of state-craft went to show that when a question had taken strong hold on a large population, that when it had become one of the political realities, it was no longer met with a flat negative, but with an alternative proposition. By a reasonable alternative one part of a party, the moderate part, was certain to be satisfied, and so the combination was at an end. (Hear, hear.) Such an alternative would not satisfy extremists, but it would take from them the alliance of those who gave their extreme demands weight. It could not be pretended any longer, with the two votes of this week on record, that the demand for this change came from any one side of the House, or from mere agitators, when they had around them such advocates of it as the member for Welland (Mr. Street), the member for West Brant (Mr. Ryerson), and the able lawyers who had spoken and voted for it (the Messrs. Cameron). (Hear, hear.) As a member for Montreal, a neutral ground, and a cosmopolitan community if there was one in the Province, he (Mr. McGee) appealed to his honourable friend (Mr. Rose), as a joint representative of that city, to be true to the growing public opinion of that great city, which was in favour of an amicable, rational settlement of this question.

It was not considered an unreasonable principle in Montreal, that numbers should be proportionately represented; and he hoped, now his honourable friend was untrammelled by office, he would be true to his better instincts, and vote for this reasonable amendment. (Hear, hear.) If the 285,000 excess in Upper Canada were grouped in two or three great cities, the size of Montreal or Quebec, but situated on Lake Erie or Lake Huron, could they remain unrepresented in that House? (Hear, hear.) Now the rural population were as valuable to provinces as the urban population—the country made the town—they filled the Treasury, and should be heard where they were taxed. (Hear.) And heard they might be assured they would be, and the longer they resisted the *minimum* of concession, the higher would rise the *maximum* of demand. (Cheers.) He much mistook the character of the 90,000 people of Huron and Bruce, for example, if they were content to have but one representative, while eight Lower Canada counties, having in the aggregate only 90,000 inhabitants, had eight members on the floor of that House. (Hear, hear.) Nor was the inequality confined to contrasts between Upper and Lower Canada. The counties of Middlesex, Oxford, and Ontario, with little over 40,000 inhabitants, had two members each, while Huron and Bruce, with twice the number, had but half the representation! It may be asked where will concession stop if we once disturb the existing limitation? To that he would answer that concession could only stop with our growth and development, and that every new community sufficiently numerous should have a representative of its own. The hon. member who had last sat down, spoke of England's stability. Why, Sir, what folly this is! We are, as to England, in the Heptarchy stage of our existence. (Hear, hear.) We learned no such sentiment about immutability from the honourable gentleman for Montreal East when the knife was drawn through the map of Montreal in order to divide the liberal interest of that city. When in twenty-four hours a petition came down, signed by 3,000 citizens of Montreal, against that measure, there was no such pro-

test on the ground of stability then. (Hear, hear.) Huron and Bryce would not be put off by the plea of stability. But he might be asked what guarantee will you give to Lower Canada if new eastern counties come to knock at our doors year after year? (Hear, hear.) His answer was, Lower Canada had her Imperial guarantee—she had her guarantee of numbers, her own brave blood, and the free-man's final guarantee—the right to carry arms. (Hear, hear.) But in addition there was another guarantee he would allude to—he would say to the gentlemen of Lower Canada—settle up your country! If the same pains had been taken the last ten years to settle Lower Canada, that had been taken in Upper Canada, the disparity of representation would be now on the other side. (Hear, hear.) He must speak plainly, but not disrespectfully, when he said that such pains had not been taken. The British and German emigration was allowed to pass through Lower Canada as if there was no habitable land either to their right hand or to their left. Now, they had Sir William Logan's opinion, and the Hon. Mr. Cauchon's official report of 1856, that there was more habitable land now unsettled in Lower than in Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.) [Mr. McGee here read a quotation from Hon. Mr. Cauchon's Report of 1856, showing that there was room enough in the St. Maurice region for eleven millions of people.] Yet nothing had been done to open up that country, and the *Three Rivers Inquirer* of the 25th instant stated, that it was said to be, because "the Hon. Mr. Turcotte was opposed to the settlement of old country emigrants, or the appointment of an agent at Three Rivers." (Hear, hear.) But the fact was undoubted—the emigrant was not retained in this section of the country. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. SICOTTE.—Where will we go to?

Mr. MCGEE.—There is room enough for all. (Cheers.) The population of this country will count by millions before its frontiers give way from repletion. (Cheers.) And what has been the consequence of squandering the Colonisation Fund of Lower Canada on parish improvements? The

obstacles that kept out the foreigner kept out the native, and sent the surplus Canadians of the old parishes across the line. This was the penalty of obstruction and exclusiveness—what would have served the stranger would have preserved the son of the soil—but both suffered together by this stolid indifference to the settlement of Lower Canada. Were they keeping the St. Lawrence for a preserve for their great-grandchildren in the 20th century? Well, the rest of the Province would not stand still on that account, and if they would not march, they would be left behind—that was certain. (Cheers.) In no sectional spirit—as a Provincial man—as a Canadian representative—who felt bound to utter the vital truth which he held, he abjured the French Canadian statesman who now wielded the destiny of this land, to surround its admirable institutions with more people, of whatever tongue or origin. (Cheers.) They could bear inspection—they would inspire love and reverence: all that they needed to be honoured and loved, was to be known. Upper and Lower Canada differed in their views of Christian duty, as they did in other views, but on nearer examination they would find much to admire each in the other. Unless hon. gentlemen opposite were in secret desirous of a dissolution of the Union, *pure et simple*, he begged them to meet the Upper Canadians with an alternative proposition, instead of an arbitrary negative, and not to neglect the last and best of guarantees against western preponderance—to settle up their own section of the country. (Cheers.)



## EMIGRATION AND COLONISATION.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, APRIL 25TH, 1862.

THE House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. McGee's motion of the 8th instant, "That a Select Committee be appointed to take into consideration the subjects of Immigration and Colonisation, especially with reference to the Spring Immigration of the present year; with power to send for persons and papers, and to report from time to time."

Mr. McGEE, after a few introductory remarks, said:—  
In moving for this Committee, Mr. Speaker, I might move on the ground that it is not only called for in itself, but that as the Province expends large sums annually to arrive at a knowledge of its own resources, this Committee is the natural corollary of that expenditure. Turning over the public accounts, yesterday placed on the table, I find the following principal items of expenditure for what we may call, in general terms, exploring or exhibiting the resources of the Province—

Geological Survey (1861) . . . . .	\$20,315 00
Bureau of Agriculture, salaries, &c. . . . .	8,091 00
Contingencies . . . . .	6,805 00
Roads and Bridges (C.E.) . . . . .	57,845 00
Improvement Fund (C.W.) . . . . .	17,398 00
Colonisation Roads (C.W.) . . . . .	54,000 00
(C.E.) . . . . .	52,424 00
Crown Lands Surveys (West) . . . . .	75,414 00
(East) . . . . .	41,969 00
Colonisation Road Agents (West) . . . . .	11,392 00
(East) . . . . .	
Inspection of Agencies (West) . . . . .	2,976 00
(East) . . . . .	3,514 00

- Included in the item of "Roads and Bridges," C.R.

Agricultural Societies (West)	\$53,894 00
" " (East)	48,725 00
Emigration service, Inland and Foreign Agencies, &c., as per page 112, Public Accounts	45,329 00
Emigration Commission	400 00
Total	\$501,612 00

Thus, we see, that \$500,000 per annum may be said to be the present annual expenditure of the Province on the various branches of administration which fall directly within the scope of this Committee's inquiry. This sum, \$500,000, is about four per cent. on the total revenues of the Province, and whether four per cent. be a sufficient proportion for these branches of the public service I am not now going to discuss; in my own opinion, ten per cent. of the revenue would not be an excessive expenditure on the work of increasing the population and decreasing the wilderness; but I content myself with pointing out that we spend \$500,000 a-year on geologists, surveyors, agents (inland and foreign), roads and bridges, agricultural societies, and an agricultural bureau, and that we ought to have something handsome to show at the end of each year for such expenditure. (Hear, hear.) On a point of most immediate importance—the Spring Emigration, and the arrangements made to meet it,—I must entreat the House to extend to me its indulgence, in the next place. I need hardly say, that I did not take up this inquiry in the beginning with any view either to serve or to injure particular individuals, and that I do not intend—so far as I can help it—to let the reform demanded assume any vindictive aspect. (Hear, hear.) But justice must be done fearlessly done, in the Port of Quebec, the coming season, or the loud cry of disappointed hope, going home from this side, will reach us all; from the highest to the humblest person connected with this Government. Having originally recommended the appointment of provincial agents abroad, in my report of 1860, I was of course happy to see that that suggestion had been acted upon, as far as Great Britain and Ireland, Germany, France, and Belgium were concerned. There may be some doubts as to whether the

persons appointed *pro tem.* to fill those offices have been always the fittest persons for their work—there may be some doubts whether they have been stationed at the best points for their work, but there can be no doubt that a few able agents on the other side of the Atlantic must be of benefit to this Province. The French agency has been objected to in some quarters as useless and unprofitable, but when we see from the statistics of New York that during the last few years from ten to twelve per cent. of all the arrivals at that port were from Havre—some 8,000 last year out of 68,000—when we see that Havre ranks as a North American port next to Liverpool and Hamburg in this trade, I cannot concur that the appointment of Mr. Verret was a needless or improper one. If Mr. Verret should not succeed in doing much in France, he may make better progress in Belgium and Switzerland—at least let us hope so, for the sake of the undertaking. (Hear, hear.) Whether Berlin is the proper station for the German agent, Mr. Wagner, despatched by the Crown Lands Department, I cannot pretend to say, but my impression is, that one of the great northern shipping ports—Bremen or Hamburg—ought to be his head-quarters. (Hear, hear.) But another appointment equally important, which was suggested in 1860, has not yet been made,—I mean a Canadian agent at New York. By the New York booking system, we know that, in 1859, 2,000 emigrants were landed at that port whose destination was Canada; that, in 1860, there were 1,880; and in 1861, 1,554 similarly bound for Canada;—or, in three years, 5,434 settlers. Now this is a contingent well worth looking after. And, supposing such an agent appointed at New York, it might be made part of his business during other seasons of the year to visit those neighbourhoods in which there are native Canadians willing and anxious to return to this country, to report the facts, and to arrange for their return. (Hear, hear.) He would also meet with other British subjects—with some of those hundreds of natives of the British Isles who have besieged the Consulates in the great cities, anxious to be sent back again to their old homes,

where they will find themselves, on their return, strangers indeed, and from which they may be forced, in all probability, to a second emigration. (Hear, hear.) I am not an advocate for the creation of new offices, Mr. Speaker, unless when they are shown to be really required; but I would not be doing my duty to the Province, if I did not once more point out the importance of a proper agent at New York, as well as at Liverpool, Havre, and Ham-  
burgh. As to the new arrangement of the Inland Agents within this Province, I am not prepared to speak in detail at this moment; besides, so much depends on the personal habits and character of the men, and so much on the head of the department, that I shrink from discussing particular reforms until we have examined them in Committee; and I hope we may have the united sanction of the Committee for recommendations which, as an individual, and a member in opposition, I fear would have little chance of adoption—coming from me. I will not, therefore, dwell on that point; for it must rest, in the end, with the Minister of Agriculture whether any of these offices are to continue sinecures or to be made realities. Mr. Speaker, the mention of New York reminds me of the truly sagacious and politic care which that State and City has of late years exercised over the emigrants arriving in their waters. Formerly it was not so. But for the past ten or twelve years no department of the public service has been more steadily improving than the department committed to the Commissioners of Emigration. I have here their last Annual Report, and it is highly instructive to see how they handled the 68,000 aliens landed in their port during 1861. I have thrown their results into a tabular form of my own, for greater convenience, and I find that—

The arrivals at New York in 1861 were	68,311
Of these, arrived in steamers	21,110
In sailing ships	37,201
Total number of vessels	453
Average of passengers to ship	150

*Destination of New York arrivals in 1861.*

New York City and State	32,783
Pennsylvania and New Jersey	7,006
New England States	5,779
Western States	16,595
Southern States	3,755
Canada West	1,544
Canada East	8
Balance to California, &c.	

*Aid and Employment Afforded.*

Amount received at Castle Garden and its agencies, from friends of emigrants in interior, to assist emigrants on arrival	\$17,591 00
Advances made to emigrants on deposits of baggage	1,299 00
Of which was repaid during the year	1,267 00

Number who received treatment or relief in Emigrant Refuge and Hospital	5,079
Number of emigrants sent back to Europe at their own request	413
Number provided with temporary lodging in New York, Albany, Buffalo, &c.	6,177
Temporarily supplied with food in Castle Garden	1,389
Number of persons of both sexes provided with situations by Commissioners and their agents in New York City and State	6,023

*Emigrant Correspondence.*

Letters written at Castle Garden for emigrants	1,682
Letters received for ditto	641

It will be seen by a glance at these figures how thoroughly the Americans have, to use their own expression, "realised the idea" that emigration is a source of national wealth. For some they have nursed and tended; for some they have found prompt employment; for others they have made themselves clerks and correspondents; for others they have advanced cash on deposits of baggage, which they report have always been repaid. (Hear, hear.) We may deprecate as we please some traits of American life; but, in working up the raw material of a new country into populous and prosperous communities, it would be well for us to imitate their sagacity, and their system. (Hear, hear.) I refer to the New York arrangements, to

point out the absolute necessity of an enclosed landing-place for emigrants arriving in our own port. Is it not a reproach that we here, in Quebec, have less care for our fellow-subjects, present or prospective, than the Americans have at New York (hear, hear);—that the newly-arrived strangers on our docks, male and female, may be exposed and tempted to their ruin, as they have been too often tempted and seduced, both male and female, for want of a properly-provided landing depôt? I do not pretend that we could set up anything on the scale of the New York buildings—there is no need for so costly an establishment; but there is need for a safe and ordinary means of accommodating over night 200 or 300 persons, who are anxious to draw breath before continuing their pilgrimage to the interior. In the name of humanity—in the name of common decency—I appeal to the gentlemen opposite to see that some temporary landing-place and Emigrant Refuge is provided, before the Spring fleet pours its passengers in upon us. It was mainly to effect this one point that I was so anxious to obtain my Committee before the Easter recess;—but it is not yet too late, if the hon. gentlemen opposite will order it to be done. (Loud cries of "Hear.") The value of every suggestion of this kind must depend, Mr. Speaker, not only on its fitness, but also on the character of the Minister entrusted with its execution if it should be adopted—I allude to the Minister of Agriculture. Now, it seems to me, Sir, and I believe the opinion to be a growing one, that that portfolio ought to be estimated as one of the most important,—requiring as good abilities as any other in the Administration. Every one admits that the legal offices of those who may be called our Ministers of Justice,—that the Finances, the Crown Lands, and the Public Works, require able men to fill them well; but, hitherto, it seems to have been considered that the Ministry of Agriculture—including, as it ought to do, Emigration—might be given to any second or third-rate man. (Hear, hear.) Now, what should be fairly required as a standard of ability in such a department? Should the Minister appointed know as much as

a clerk under the Civil Service Act? Should he know what the Provincial Examiners insist upon as the standard for every land surveyor? Should he know all parts of his own country well, and something of other countries from which we draw so much of our labour, and to which we export so much of our produce? I will not be guilty of the arrogance of defining the duties of such an office by any description of my own, but I will seek for an example of what such a Minister ought to be; and, happily, I can find an illustrious example in the history of this Province, in the person of one of its old French Governors, whose memory is too little known among us in these days. The Swedish Naturalist, Peter Kalm, a disciple of Linnæus, who visited Canada, and stayed some time in this city in the year 1749, has left us, in his "Travels," the following account of the Marquis de la Gallissonniere, then Governor-General of this country:—

"He (the Marquis de la Gallissonniere) has a surprising knowledge in all branches of science, and especially in natural history; in which he is so well versed, that when he began to speak with me about it, I imagined I saw our great Linnæus under a new form. When he spoke of the use of natural history, of the method of learning, and employing it to raise the state of a country, I was astonished to see him take his reasons from politics, as well as natural philosophy, mathematics, and other sciences. I own that my conversation with this nobleman was very instructive to me; and I always drew a deal of useful knowledge from it. He told me several ways of employing natural history to the purposes of politics, and to make *a country powerful in order to depress its envious neighbours*. Never has natural history had a greater promoter in this country; and it is very doubtful whether he will ever have his equal here. As soon as he got the place of Governor-General he began to take those measures for getting information in natural history which I have mentioned before. When he saw people who had been in a settled part of the country, especially in the more remote parts, or had travelled in those parts, he always questioned

them about the trees, plants, earths, stones, ores, animals, &c., of the place. He likewise inquired what use the inhabitants made of those things; in what state their husbandry was; what lakes, rivers, and passages there are; and a number of other particulars. Those who seemed to have clearer notions than the rest, were obliged to give him circumstantial descriptions of what they had seen. He himself wrote down all the accounts he received; and by this great application, so uncommon among persons of his rank, he soon acquired a knowledge of the most distant parts of America. The priests, commandants of forts, and of several distant places, are often surprised by his questions, and wonder at his knowledge, when they come to Quebec to pay their visits to him; for he often tells them that near such a mountain, or on such a shore, &c., where they often went a-hunting, there are some particular plants, trees, earth, ores, &c., for he had got a knowledge of those things before. From whence it happened that some of the inhabitants believed that he had a preternatural knowledge of things, as he was able to mention all the curiosities of places, sometimes near two hundred Swedish miles from Quebec, though he never was there himself. Never was there a better statesman than he; and nobody can take better measures, and choose more proper means for improving a country, and increasing its welfare." (Hear, hear.)

This is the portrait of a Franco-Canadian statesman of the eighteenth century, who considered "natural history," which then included geology and metallurgy, an essential study for a statesman in a country like Canada. Now I will not, under cloak of the Marquis de la Gallissonniere's great name, stoop to draw any satirical contrasts between the present holder of the portfolio of Agriculture and the Marquis de la Gallissonniere. But supposing, Mr. Speaker, the organisation of the department to be all that it ought to be, in its head and its members, let us consider the attractions we can offer in Canada to intending settlers.\*

\* The very rich deposits of gold on the Chaudière and its tributaries, in the Quebec district, had not yet attracted public attention. They have



It is true that this Province has neither the golden rivers of California nor the luxurious climate of Australia; but it has two things which free-born men value even higher—complete civil and religious liberty, and productive land to be acquired by any man's industry. Our chief moral attraction must ever lie in our institutions; our chief material attraction must lie in cheap or free land. The institutions of this Province, whatever defects may exist, are, take them all in all, the most desirable in the world; and if we can only succeed in keeping down the wrathful spirit of religious bigotry—bigotry on all sides—that despotic temper which makes a bigot in religion and a despot in politics out of the self-same stuff;—if we only succeed in keeping down that spirit, the institutions of Canada ought naturally to attract valuable accessions to our population from abroad. As to our material advantages, the land resources of this Province are not so well understood, even by Canadians themselves, as they should be. Which of us familiarly thinks of the hundred million acres in Lower, and fifty million acres in Upper Canada, so ably and fully described in that *rade mecum* of such information, the Crown Land Commissioner's Report of 1857, for which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cauchon) and those who assisted him in its preparation deserve the highest credit,—a Report that ought to be familiar to every Member of this House. (Hear, hear.) But confining ourselves to the public lands actually in the market in this Province, we find that we commence the year with over 7,600,000 acres of Crown Lands in the two sections; over 500,000 acres of Clergy Lands,—not to mention the School Lands, the Indian Lands, and the Ordnance Lands, withheld, and I think very properly withheld, for the present. I will trouble the House with a tabular view of these lands, taken from the new emigration pamphlet, giving the acreage in round numbers only:—

since been tested in the most practical way, but only over a limited extent of the auriferous field, and the result so far has been such as to encourage the formation of several mining companies, chiefly by capitalists at Boston and New York.

## CANADA EAST.

	Acres.
Counties on the north side of the Ottawa	1,095,000
Counties on the north side of St. Lawrence	1,378,000
Counties south side of St. Lawrence	1,544,000
Total available in Canada East, in 1862	4,015,000

## CANADA WEST.

In the Ottawa and Huron country	600,000
Continuations of Lennox, Frontenac, Addington, and District of Nipissing	660,000
Continuations of Hastings, and Peterborough, Victoria, Simcoe, and part of Nipissing	1,170,000
District of Algoma	200,000
Fort William (Lake Superior)	64,000
Total available in Canada West, in 1862	2,694,000

These are the figures according to the new emigration pamphlet, while according to the Crown Land Commissioner's Report for the year ending, December 31st, 1861, the Crown Lands actually in the market at that date were:—

	Acres.
Canada West	2,021,229½
Canada East	5,593,833
Total Crown Lands in market	7,615,062½

This domain might be diminished at the rate of a million acres a year,—by 10,000 or 20,000 one hundred acre farms, and the decrease would not be felt,—the want would be supplied by the new surveys, on which the Province keeps constantly employed from two to three hundred land surveyors. As the House is aware, Mr. Speaker, a percentage of this immense domain is very liberally given away in "free grants;" to what extent that percentage may be actually in demand I am not now going to discuss, but the average price at which the lands of the Crown, disposed of by sale, are sold, cannot be considered exorbitant. In Upper Canada the average price obtained in the sales of last year was, for the Crown Lands \$1.25, the School Lands \$1.50, and the Clergy Lands \$2.50; in

Lower Canada the average prices were, for the Crown Lands less than 50 cents, and for the Clergy Lands less than \$1 per acre. Considering that on these purchases five years' time is usually given, and that a first instalment of ten per cent. is all that is usually required, it is evident that the first cost of our public lands cannot be any great obstacle to the more general settlement of our waste territory. Are there, then, defects in the machinery by which the lands are to be settled?—are the formalities expensive?—are the surveys inaccessible?—are there hostile combinations? These are all considerations of the utmost importance for this House, and especially for the Committee which I have proposed. Before passing altogether from this point, I cannot but remark on the existence among us of certain landed monopolies, which, I fear, have given Canada a bad name for a poor man's country to get. I allude to such corporations as the British American Land Company and the Canada Company; and speaking of these great companies, I was sorry to see, Sir, by the Crown Lands Report for this year, that Mr. Vankoughnet had disposed "of ten townships *en bloc*" in the Ottawa and Lake Huron tract to another of these companies. I know that the late Commissioner, to whose great administrative abilities I have always cheerfully paid homage, intended and stipulated that settlement duties should be rigorously exacted of this new company. (Hear, hear.) But who is to answer that his successors will be equally resolute? Who is to guarantee the Province that a corporation rich enough to purchase will not be influential enough to hold up these ten townships at an excessive figure, and so keep back the surrounding settlements? What has been our experience of these large landed companies? They all came into existence with the fairest possible professions towards this Province. The Canada Company and the British American Company were created by Royal Charter before the days of Responsible Government, so we are not fairly answerable for them, as we shall be for others, if others are to be created by our own action. The Canada Company's report for the present year is now in my possession, and shows

how the  
upon C  
director  
gressive  
say:—  
"The  
prietors  
of the C  
feature  
tions de  
gressive  
the rem  
disposed  
periods,

1829 to  
1841 to  
1851 to

"It v  
quantity  
been les  
realised  
No de  
the Cana  
pany, an  
if the gr  
some de  
structed  
of wild l  
factory a  
The tran  
months  
report, as

The co  
36,8007.

how they have used their chartered privileges to speculate upon Canadian lands during the past few years. The directors congratulate the proprietors on the constant progressive rise of prices in their sales of wild lands. They say :—

"The Directors again draw the attention of the proprietors to the steady annual increase in the market-value of the Company's lands as a most satisfactory and important feature in their affairs; the ultimate success of their operations depending, as it does in some degree, upon the progressive increase in the price to be obtained from the sale of the remainder of their estate. The subjoined table of land disposed of since the year 1829, arranged in decennial periods, furnishes an interesting illustration on this head:—

1829 to 1840 . . . . .	736,608 acres, at 11s. 1d. per acre,
1841 to 1850 . . . . .	980,117 . . . . . 15s. 4d. . . . .
1851 to 1861 . . . . .	493,873 . . . . . 32s. 4d. . . . .

"It will be seen from these figures that, although the quantity of land disposed of during the last ten years has been less by one-half than in the preceding period, it realised more than double the amount."

No doubt this is a most satisfactory state of things to the Canada Company, to the Directors of the Canada Company, and to the proprietors of the Canada Company, but if the growth of the western section of the Province is in some degree retarded, if its increasing population is obstructed by this, for the American world, exorbitant price of wild land (32s. sterling per acre), it is not quite so satisfactory a state of things for Canada as for the Company. The transactions of the Company during the first two months of the present year, are figured up in the same report, as follows:—

"From the 1st January to the 28th February, 1862 :—  
 424 acres have been sold at 32s. 11d. per acre.  
 6,221 acres have been leased at 56s. 11d. per acre.  
 24,522 acres converted to freeholds."

The collections of money for the same period amount to 36,800*l.* currency, viz. :—

" On account of purchase money	£20,875
" rent and interest	9,581
" sundries	314

"The sum of 31,000*l.* sterling," adds the Report, "has been remitted home by the Commissioners since the 31st December."

I have no disposition, Mr. Speaker, to exaggerate the evil in our state of society of these great land companies, but I think it my duty to state to this House that both in the Eastern Townships, where the British American Land Company still retains *en bloc* many thousands of acres, and in those counties in Upper Canada in which the Canada Company retains its vast reserves, that they are generally looked upon as lets rather than as aids to settlement. They allow their lands to lie waste, unless they can get their own exorbitant prices, or if they lease them it is often to take them back again from the disheartened lessees; for, in any event, the value is certain to increase by the mere increase of the neighbouring settlements on the lands of the Crown. The whole surrounding country is tugging to lift that dead weight of corporate lands held *en bloc*, and if a more liberal policy is not adopted by them—if a policy less hostile to Canadian interests is not adopted—this Province may be compelled, in self-defence, to inquire by what means it may best mitigate this evil, and enfranchise the large scopes of country now held in worse than mortmain clutch.\* The Clergy Reserves and the Seigniorial Tenure, strong as they were, had to give way to the requirements of a growing society; and those companies, if they are wise for themselves, will not overdo the opportunities which they unfortunately possess, to retard, in many sections, the growth of population. (Cheers.) It might seem to be a sufficient cure for this evil, that the millions of acres of Crown Lands in the market were to be had, in Upper Canada, on an average at \$2 per acre, and in Lower Canada, from \$1 to 50 cents per acre; but, unfortunately,

\* This language should be received with many modifications, as larger experience has instructed us. But the objection as to abuse of privileges remains good.

the gre  
land; t  
gives th  
"monopo  
America  
hear.)  
relates t  
roads, e  
Land Co  
House,  
the work  
as comp  
Province  
acres; w  
exceeded  
grant" I  
number  
roads, an  
those ne  
figures, a  
Province

Roads  
Addington  
Bobcayge  
Hastings  
Muskoka  
Opeongo

Total Up

Roads i  
Elgin roa  
Matane  
Kempt

The color  
Canada w

\* This fig  
"free grant

the great companies have got into the very heart of the land; they have got prime soil centrally situated—which gives them the opportunity they so usuriously employ, to monopolise and overcharge—according to all existing American standards of the value of wild lands. (Hear, hear.) Another topic in connection with our land policy relates to what are called the Colonisation or "Free Grant" roads, east and west. (Hear, hear.) From the Crown Land Commissioner's Report, just laid on the table of the House, we may see at a glance with what unequal strides the work of free colonisation went on, last year, in Upper as compared with Lower Canada. In this section of the Province all the free grants fell a fraction short of 10,000 acres; while in Upper Canada the free grants somewhat exceeded 30,000 acres. Now, as to the quantity of "free grant" land reduced to cultivation during the year, the number of settlers actually established on the colonisation roads, and the reported value of the annual production on those new lines of road, I have taken the Commissioner's figures, and I find that the result in each section of the Province, for last year, stands thus:—

Roads in Upper Canada.	Acres.	Settlers.	Total value of Products in 1861.
Addington	726	27	\$38,562.20
Bobcaygeon.	—	—	30,007.10
Hastings.	960	88	44,418.15
Muskoka	300	62	4,900.23
Opeongo	416	40	36,716.32
Total Upper Canada	2,402	217	\$154,584.00*
Roads in Lower Canada.	Arpents.	Settlers.	Value of Products in 1861.
Elgin road	731	29	\$15,000.72
Mataue "	705	—	4,443.15
Kempt "	305	14	1,317.70
	1,741	43	\$20,762.57

The colonisation road expenditure last year in Lower Canada was over \$52,000, and for that very considerable

\* This figure must be taken, not for the year 1861 alone, but for all "free grant" reclamations on those roads to that date.

sum and the donation of 10,000 acres, we have 43 new "free grant" settlers added to the pioneer population. Those 10,000 acres, according to the statutory limitation of 100 acres the grant, ought to give the Province at least 100 such settlers. It may be that on some of these free grants, settlement duties will be commenced the present spring, but it is evident that taking 1861 by itself, the acres granted are not represented by the required number of grantees. (Hear, hear.) In Upper Canada (exclusive of the Bobcaygeon road, not returned), we have only 217, instead of 300 new settlers for 30,000 acres; but this is a nearer approximation to the requirements of the law, than has been made in Lower Canada. It would be instructive to know what proportion of these "free grants," so freely advertised abroad, were taken up by Emigrants and what portion by native Canadians; but I believe there is, at present, no official information of that kind—unless it may be supplied in the Report of the Minister of Agriculture, not yet in our hands. (Hear, hear.) Another important consideration for us; at this moment, remains to be taken up. We were invited, as you will remember, Mr. Speaker, in His Excellency's speech, at the opening of the session, to consider the highly important subject of our military defences, and we have assured His Excellency that we will give our best attention to that subject. I have full confidence that this House will keep good faith with His Excellency; but, Mr. Speaker, I deny that we can wisely consider the subject of our defences apart from the subject of our population. (Hear, hear.) Nay, more; we must consider it in connection with the growth of that American population who alone can ever cross our border in anger. Our boundary is theirs; but while on our side there are at present about 2,500,000 inhabitants, in the States that face our frontier there are nearly 20,000,000. Does any one believe that we could hold our own, with the odds against us eight to one? Allow everything you please for a people defending their own soil—allow everything you please for Imperial assistance—the disproportion between the two populations is so enormous as to inspire

many with the apprehension that it is a mere question of time, when it must come to our turn to be devoured by our gigantic neighbour. I feel, Sir, that these fears are neither weak nor fanciful; but I still hold that if we use our present opportunities as we ought—if we fill in our frontiers with a sturdy yeomanry—if we create and establish a peasant proprietary, trained from youth to the use of arms, that Canada may fairly pretend to an independent existence on this continent. I have no knowledge of military affairs, Mr. Speaker, but I would beg the attention of the House in considering our defences, as well as the present subject, to a glance at the map of the country, both the populated and unsettled parts of it, and to the inquiry which arises from even such a glance, what connection exists between the distribution of our people, and their resources for self-defence? It seems probable that we shall all be obliged to study the map of the country hereafter, more than we ever did before; and it is impossible, it seems to me, to cast even a cursory glance at it without feeling that we occupy one of the most peculiar positions—that our population, so far, is the most peculiarly distributed—of any to be found anywhere else on this side of the world. Our great central valley from Cornwall to the Saguenay is banked on both sides with settlements, facing to the front and not extending, on an average, except up the lateral valley of the Ottawa, and in the direction of the Eastern Townships, 50 miles from the St. Lawrence; we have thus a long narrow riband of population, one-seventh the breadth of its own length, as singularly shaped a country as eye ever beheld. East of the junction of the Saguenay with the St. Lawrence, our population is carried down to the gulf by the south shore alone, while west of Cornwall, it is found only to the north of the Upper St. Lawrence and the great Lakes. The peopled part of the Province thus presents the shape of a long, fantastic letter “S”—a waving Lesbian line, which, to my eye, is neither a line of beauty nor of grace, nor of defensive strength. At and above Cornwall, this twist of population is defined by the 45th parallel of latitude, but there is no necessity for any such



peculiarity in Lower Canada. From the Ottawa to the St. Maurice, and from the St. Maurice to the Saguenay on the one shore; from the Chateaugay to the Du Loup on the other shore, there is the strongest testimony of the best authorities—surveyors, geologists, lumberers, practical men of all origins—that three, four, seven-fold the present population may find ample space and remuneration for their industry. (Hear, hear.) Fortunately for us who advocate the recruiting of a productive rather than of a destructive army, science with its hammer and its theodolite has been for twenty years at work in these wildernesses. Our living geologists have exploded one fallacy—that the granite country between the Ottawa and Lake Huron could never sustain a numerous population; and this is precisely the same country, geologically, which we find open to settlement in Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) This is precisely the character of the North Shore counties between Montreal and Quebec, where, if ever Canada stands at bay, in defence of her separate nationality, it must be with her back to that great Laurentian chain of highlands which trends away from the Saguenay to the Ottawa and from the Ottawa to Lake Huron. (Cheers.) I have not a particle of desire, Mr. Speaker, to underrate or overrate the untouched resources either of Upper or Lower Canada; it is as truly gratifying to me to read the testimony of Mr. Symmes, Superintendent of the St. Maurice Works, to the excellent soil in portions of that valley, as it is to read the testimony of Mr. P. L. S. Salter that there is abundant room for “sixty-five townships of thirty-six square miles each,” on the north south of Lake Huron. (Hear, hear.) I rejoice to find the country widening before us, as we advance both east and west; I rejoice to know that we have no limit to our growth, but the line of perpetual frost, beyond the Laurentian mountains. (Cheers.) Another subject not-remotely involved in the object of my Committee, is the representation question. We cannot be blind to the fact that at the Union, Lower Canada contained some 225,000 more inhabitants than Upper Canada, and that now she contains 290,000 less. This is an actual

decrease of above 500,000 in twenty years. Now, does any rational man believe that this disparity can continue, and yet that strict equality of representation can be upheld? If not, what then is the obvious remedy? Have the limits of population in Lower Canada been reached? Are her cultivable lands all taken up? So far from it, that I am well satisfied, Mr. Speaker, from all the evidence taken before the several Committees over which I presided—from all the reports of men of science and men of business, that even below Quebec the soil and the climate will not be found materially different from the soil and climate of the still unsettled parts of Upper Canada, between Lake Huron and the Ottawa. There are with us two regions to the North and South of the St. Lawrence—what are commonly called “the St. Maurice country” and the “Eastern Townships;” we have abundant evidence, obtained at great expense to the Province, of the extent and resources of both these regions. Popularly, the Eastern Townships are tolerably well known; much has been done for them, and much more ought to be done. (Hear, hear.) That instead of a quarter of a million they are capable of sustaining three to four million souls, is generally admitted,—but the St. Maurice is a complete *terra incognita*. The summer traveller who hears steam blown off at night at Three Rivers, little dreams that he has just passed a great river, which two hundred miles from its outlet is still a great river; which drains a country larger than all Scotland,—and as capable as Scotland of bearing its three millions of inhabitants. (Hear, hear.) Why is this great valley shut up from the native and the immigrant settler alike? Why does the native Canadian turn disheartened away from its pathless woods? Why does the crowded passenger ship and the laden steamer pass by its port, Three Rivers, year by year, and day by day? When last I spoke on this subject in this place, I quoted a statement which had appeared in a local paper that opposition to its settlement came chiefly from an hon. member of this House (Hon. Mr. Turcotte). The paper referred to has since withdrawn that statement, and I am happy to repeat, unsolicited, the

correction, for I could not believe that any Canadian statesman would be capable of entering into a conspiracy against any class of Her Majesty's subjects seeking a home in this country. (Hear, hear.) We are here, Mr. Speaker, within 100 miles direct of the middle waters of that great river on which there are as yet but two or three townships organised—Polette, Turcotte, and Shawinigan. Quebec wants a back country—and 30 or 40 miles of a road, continued from Gosford, would tap the St. Maurice at the Tuque, the centre of its lumber operations, and give Quebec a back country. A lateral road again from the St. Maurice to the waters of the La Lièvre and the Gatineau would not be so heavy an undertaking as the Opeongo Road, in Upper Canada, which, from Renfrew to Lake Huron, is to be 186 miles in length. Such roads might serve to give immediate employment to a number of emigrant labourers, under skilled leaders, to familiarise them to the use of the axe, and to prepare them in one season for dealing with "the bush" in the next. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend, the member for Napierville (Mr. Bureau), who has given great attention to this subject, has a notice on the paper for an increase of the Colonisation road grant, and, under certain conditions, I think such an increase desirable; but everything depends—everything—on the spirit and system in which the service is hereafter to be administered. If that department was in the hands of a Marquis de la Gallissionniere—if such a man lived in these degenerate days—he would soon, without favoritism or injustice, or conspiracy, redress the balance of population between the east and west—he would give us internal peace on just principles, and external security, on the guarantee of our united numbers. (Cheers.) I cannot but think, Mr. Speaker, that, under a proper administrative system, the county agricultural societies, and the municipalities, might also be made important auxiliaries in the settlement of our waste lands. By the new emigration pamphlet just published, we learn that certain municipalities have informed the Bureau of a demand for upwards of 13,500 farm labourers, servants, and mechanics. It strikes me that

these little local parliaments might do something more, if they were not afraid of being flooded with a pauper immigration. But that fear, in view of the present social state of Great Britain and Ireland, is quite chimerical. The pauper class is no longer there; they have been cut out of the basis of society; we shall, fortunately, never see again the scenes Canada saw in 1832 and 1847. The municipalities, then, ought to be enlisted with the government in operations in common, to feel a direct-interest in the common object—to make Canada a powerful and populous country. There is yet another impediment in our way to which I must allude before I close. It is, the impression which seems to prevail in some quarters, that there is an inevitable conflict of interests between the lumberer and the actual settler. But this conflict the spread of intelligence will postpone indefinitely. To the experienced eye of the surveyor or the geologist, the character of the timber indicates the character of the soil. Such men need not look below the surface; if they find large hemlocks and bass-woods mixed with white pine, maple, beech and birch, they immediately infer a warm productive soil beneath. "Mixed timber generally," says Mr. Duncan Sinclair (a good authority,—in his reply to my committee in 1860), "indicates good land." "Oak and black walnut," he adds, "always bespeak themselves good soil to grow upon." There is no necessity for the lumberer's interest and the settler's coming into collision; but valuable as the timber trade is, agriculture is more valuable still, and those charged with the supervision of the public domain should see that the greater interest is not sacrificed to the less. (Hear, hear.) The woods and forests and the agricultural settlements are necessary and useful to each other, and it ought not to be a matter of difficulty for a firm and intelligent Minister to ensure each its own field, and to guarantee all fair advantages to both. (Hear, hear.) I have thus, Mr. Speaker, endeavoured to sketch hastily and very imperfectly, in consequence of the lateness of the night, the outlines of a reform which I believe to be essential to the best interests, to the largest increase, and fullest security of this Pro-

vince. The Committee which the House is, I am rejoiced to know, well disposed to grant, will, I trust, be as much more effectual as it will be more numerous, than any of its predecessors. In alluding to the Committees of the last Parliament, I will only say of them, that any one who will take the trouble to consult the journals of this House for 1860 (vol. xviii.) and 1861 (vol. xix.) may see in detail the reforms we formerly projected and advocated. I cannot but again express my gratification that some of those reforms have been adopted—such as the agencies abroad, and districting the inland agencies, to some extent. I confess, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply, nervously anxious about the emigration of the coming spring. If it is botched, we shall be all to blame, and the fair fame of the Province will be deeply compromised; but I trust we will be able to handle this difficult interest firmly and wisely, as well as tenderly. The subject should enlist all our sympathies, for in one sense, and that no secondary one, all men have been emigrants or sons of emigrants since the first sad pair departed out of Eden, when—

“The World was all before them, where to choose  
A place of rest, and Providence their guide.”

In these latter days, as well as from the first, we renew the ancestral experience, obeying the Divine ordinance—“go forth and fill the earth and subdue it.” (Cheers.) In the eyes of the frivolous and the vain, such wanderers may be adventurers, and the term adventurer may be made to mean anything that is base and disreputable. But all the civilisation of the world has been the handiwork of just such adventurers. Heroic adventurers gave Greece her civilisation; sainted adventurers gave Rome her Christianity; the glorified adventurers celebrated in history, established in western Europe those laws and liberties which we are all endeavouring to perpetuate in America. (Cheers.) Let us rather, then, as adventurer has lost its true meaning, let us rather look upon the emigrant, wherever born and bred, as a founder, as a greater than kings and nobles, because he is destined to conquer for himself, and not by the hired

hands of other men, his sovereign dominion over some share of the earth's surface. (Cheers.) He is the true founder who plants his genealogical tree deep in the soil of the earth, whose escutcheon bears, what Cowley so happily called the best shield of nations—"a plough proper in a field arable." (Cheers.) Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of a broad, uncircumscribed Canadian patriotism, which knows in this House, in any legislative light, neither race, nor religion, nor language, but only Canada and her advancement, I beg to move for the fourth time for a Committee on Emigration and Settlement. When I see those interests adopted as their own by hon. gentlemen opposite who have the power, if they have the will, to establish a new system, I certainly feel some degree of exultation at the favourable prospects which are before this great project. I can say for myself most truly, though not at all insensible either to the favour of my constituents or my colleagues in this House, that if I were quitting public life or personal life to-morrow, I would feel a far higher satisfaction in remembering that some honest man's sheltering roof-tree had been raised by my advocacy, than if I had been Premier or Governor of the Province. (Cheers.) Let it be the mad desire of others in Europe and America to lay waste populous places; let it be our better ambition to populate waste places. In this we shall approach nearest to the Divine original, whose image, however defaced, we bear within us; in this we shall become makers and creators of new communities and a new order of things; it is to further in some degree this good work, during the present session, that I have now the honour to move for a Select Committee to take into consideration the subject of Emigration and the Settlement of the country. [The hon. gentleman sat down amid loud cheers from all parts of the House.]\*

\* On Monday, April 28, 1862, the following Committee were on motion of Mr. McGee, seconded by Mr. Bell of Lanark, appointed by the House:—Mr. McGee, Honourable Messieurs Albyn, Robinson, Foley, Loranger, Drummond and Portman, and Messrs. Jackson, McDougall, Robitaille, Joseph Dufresne, De Cazes, Desaulniers, Pope, O'Halloran, Jobin, Bell (Lanark), Dawson, Scott, Abbott, Benjamin Hooper, Dickson, Haultain and McKellar.

## INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY DIPLOMACY.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, QUEBEC, OCTOBER 2ND, 1863.

On the resolution to concur in the vote of \$20,000 for exploration and survey of the proposed Intercolonial Railway—

Hon. Mr. McGEE said that, before concurrence was taken on this resolution, he begged leave to call attention to two additional documents laid on the table, since this subject was last under consideration. Among the papers sent down, there were only two really new, the despatch from His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, dated 18th September, 1863, and an elaborate answer thereto, contained in a memorandum from the Government of Canada, dated 29th September, 1863. The letter of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor says:—"I have the honour to transmit to your Excellency (Governor-General of Canada) the accompanying copy of a minute of my Executive Council. I readily assent to the adoption of the course recommended by this minute, and entirely concur in the hope therein expressed, that no further departure from the agreement entered into between the three Provinces will be hereafter proposed by your Excellency's advisers." It was quite evident from that short note that His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick did not expect that any other portion of the Intercolonial agreement of September, 1862, would have been abandoned by the Government of Canada, except only in relation to the time of the preliminary survey. If this other memorandum of 29th September, drawn up by the Canadian Government, contained, as it professed to do, their deliberate conviction that the negotiations of 1862

had come to an end; if that was their deliberate conviction at the recent reconstruction of the Cabinet, an intimation to this effect ought to have been candidly and authoritatively conveyed to the Governments of the Lower Provinces before this, and also to this House and country. (Cheers.) But the first intimation of the abandonment on our part was made in this document of 29th September last. He called this document an uncandid document, and injurious in the highest degree to the character for good faith of this country; and if there was one thing more than another which any Government, either old or new, ought to preserve with jealousy, it was their reputation for good faith. This document went round and round Robin Hood's barn, and did not state honestly that the members of the present Government, on coming into office, agreed among themselves to regard the negotiations entered into by Messrs. Howland and Sicotte as at an end. It did not pretend to say the Government was reconstructed on that understanding. If the Government had stated that, after a full and careful re-consideration of all the facts, they were resolved to abandon the negotiations; if they had said so plainly and above board, they would have deserved credit for frankness at least. (Hear, hear.) But it was only now they came out with a declaration on this most important subject of policy, with regard to which, months ago, the present Attorney-General East had left the Cabinet; and later, refused to become again a member, on the ground that this Intercolonial Railroad question was not wholly abandoned. It was only now they took definite ground on this matter, which, if they had taken with credit to themselves, should have been taken and held from the beginning. (Cheers.) But there had been a breach of faith on the part of our Government towards both the Colonial and Imperial Governments in regard to these Intercolonial Railroad negotiations. He would adduce evidence to prove this position, and did believe the members of the House would not permit this matter to be disposed of by a stab in the dark four months after. They should, in the previous session, in duty to the Premier himself, to the members



of the former Government not in this one; in justice to the hon. negociators themselves, and by all the considerations of honour and national good faith, have stated frankly what they stated now. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman now proceeded to read the minute of the Canadian Government to support his views of their conduct in reference to breaking off of the negotiations. The second paragraph read as follows: "The Committee find that, whilst the Executive Council of New Brunswick advise the appointment of a surveyor to act in conjunction with the surveyor appointed by this Province to conduct the proposed survey, they would seem to qualify the recommendation by associating with it a hope that the survey being accomplished, the basis agreed upon by the Convention, held in September, 1862, will be adhered to, if the construction of the railway be hereafter found practicable. The Committee learn with pleasure that, so far as the survey is concerned, their plans are cordially acquiesced in by the Executive of New Brunswick, and they look forward with satisfaction to the consummation of the important undertaking, of which the survey is the preliminary step. In order that there may be no misapprehension, however, between the Governments of the Provinces having a common interest in this matter, the Committee think it right to call to mind the manner in which the negotiations conducted in London terminated, and the general position in which the question of an Intercolonial Railway at present stands in this Province. The Committee would remind your Excellency that the conditions proposed by the Imperial Government, in connection with the assistance to be rendered towards the construction of the railway, differed in some important particulars from the agreement of September, 1862, and from the instructions which the delegates sent on the part of Canada were charged to carry into effect. The Committee may refer to the distinct refusal on the part of the Imperial Government to regard the contribution which Canada might make to the Intercolonial Railway as being to that extent an expenditure for defensive purposes; the proposed sinking fund, and to the condition set forth in

the 9th. of the series of propositions presented by the Imperial Government:—"Government not to be asked for this guarantee until the line and surveys shall have been submitted to and approved by Her Majesty's Government, and until it shall have been shown to its satisfaction that the line can be constructed without further application for an Imperial guarantee." The Imperial Government thus making the proposed assistance, by way of a loan, contingent upon the results of a previous survey establishing the sufficiency of the guarantee for the full purposes for which it was to be granted. The delegates, therefore, were constrained to decline the acceptance of a proposal fettered by conditions so much at variance with their instructions, and their decision received the approval of their colleagues as being in harmony with the spirit of the agreement arrived at by the Quebec Convention, and in entire conformity with the unequivocal tone of public opinion in the Province. The negotiations founded upon the understanding entered into by the Convention of September, 1862, were regarded as terminated with the return of the delegates to this Province." Now this portion of the despatch was wholly incorrect, the delegates not being either instructed or constrained to decline any propositions made by the Imperial Government, their duty being to transmit such to the other members of the Canadian Government for their consideration. The minute (Canadian Executive Council) went on to say—"It was hoped that the Report of the Council of 25th February last would have sufficed to prevent misconception as to the necessary abandonment of the basis upon which the negotiations up to that time had been founded, and to show that any further action by the Government of this Province must be the subject of subsequent consideration." Now, he denied that the Report of February 25, '63, indicated the necessary abandonment of the basis upon which the negotiations up to that time had been founded. He denied that the modification went further than as regards the necessity of a preliminary survey, which was a totally different thing. If it could be shown that the Order in Council of 25th February, 1862, pronounced

necessary the abandonment of the basis referred to, then this memorandum of a few days ago was in harmony therewith, and the basis was abandoned by the last Government, and not the present. But no such thing could be shown. The minute of 29th September further stated, "That the carrying out of the agreement of September, 1862, necessarily depended upon the success of the negotiations with the Imperial Government, and the assent of the Legislatures of the three Provinces being obtained. *These negotiations having failed*, and it being manifest that the construction of the railway could not be attempted without Imperial aid, the Canadian Government did not feel that they were in a position to invite any action on the part of the Canadian Legislature, beyond making a preliminary survey, the results of which may lead to further negotiations, and on a different basis from that agreed to by the Convention." The hon. gentleman (Mr. McGee) denied emphatically that the negotiations had failed. Such was not the fact. The document continued as follows: "In order to promote the construction of a work which the events of each succeeding year invest with greater importance, the Committee addressed themselves to the task of devising plans whereby the attainment of the object might be secured in a manner consistent with the interests and resources of this Province. They found that the examination of the route, and the satisfactory completion of a survey was also indicated by the Imperial Government, as conditions precedent of any negotiations, and they then informed your Excellency that they had decided upon recommending an appropriation by the Legislature of Canada, for the purpose of making such a survey as is necessary to the final determination of the several proposals. In conformity with this, they have asked an appropriation of \$10,000 during the present session, and they have also appointed an engineer to proceed with the survey so soon as the requisite arrangements can be completed. The action of the Legislature has proceeded so far as that it may be regarded as *having rendered the appropriation a certainty*, and the immediate commencement of the survey is, therefore, dependent only upon the

unqualified concurrence of the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The necessity of a *prompt decision on the part of the Government of New Brunswick*, with the view of an early commencement of the survey, is obvious, inasmuch as the season during which this survey may be most advantageously performed is rapidly passing away." He would beg the House to observe that this was the first time any Canadian document attempted to place the responsibility of the rejection of the proposition for a survey on the Governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick—an attempt to make it appear that the terms of the negotiations agreed to by those Provinces, and incorporated in both their Statutes, to which they never objected, had been abandoned by them, instead of by us. (Hear, hear.) It was quite evident they did nothing of the kind. (Cheers.) And, really, to ask them to give their concurrence to the abandonment of the terms was to ask them to abandon the scheme altogether. If this was what the Canadian Government wanted, let them drop out this paltry item of \$20,000 for a survey, at once—let them get up and declare they were not in favour of the Intercolonial project itself.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. MCGEE would do the hon. gentleman the justice to say that he believed he was a friend of the scheme, and opposed to its abandonment; but his new colleagues, who were opposed to it, had dragged him with them in this matter. But his Government now asked the Lower Provinces to abandon the conditions accepted by them, and embodied in their Statutes. He (Hon. J. S. Macdonald) had become a party to that proceeding, whether willingly or unwillingly it mattered not, and upon him and his colleagues must fall the responsibility. He (Mr. McGee) could understand the conduct of the Hon. Attorney-General East, who had retired from the Macdonald-Sicotte Cabinet, and had refused to enter it again, out of hostility to the Intercolonial Railway scheme, and because it was not to be abandoned.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD—No, no.

Hon. Mr. McGEE repeated this was the reason, and it was well known to the House and the country. (Hear, hear.)

Several Opposition Members—Yes, yes.

Hon. Mr. McGEE would repeat he could understand Mr. Doria's position on this question, but he could not understand, and thought this House would not understand, why it was necessary for Government to make this elaborate statement (the minute of 29th September) to throw the onus of the abandonment of the scheme on the Lower Provinces, while in reality all the obstacles to it had arisen, one after another, in the sentiments and conduct of the present Canadian Government itself. (Cheers.) Having raised obstacle after obstacle, which the sister Provinces had generally overcome, our Government at last, having no longer an impediment to raise, had given an interpretation to their own policy on the Intercolonial Railway project, which they had never given before the electors, or the country, or this House, during all the past discussions on this subject; and now, for the first time, four months after their ascent to power, we had an authoritative expression of the new policy in relation to this subject, with an attempt to make it appear of a piece with the old policy. (Hear, hear.) One of the most singular portions of the document which he had read was, that in relation to the necessity of a prompt decision on the part of New Brunswick, in order to the commencement of a survey of the route. This prompt decision was required on the part of New Brunswick—not on our part. (Loud laughter.) This was equivalent to saying again it was only the Lower Provinces that were raising obstacles. It would be remembered that on previous occasions he had endeavoured, but failed, to extract from the Government whether they had ever informed the Governments of the Lower Provinces that they had abandoned the policy of 1862. The Attorney-General East and Finance Minister had failed to answer this question when put to them on three several occasions, during the present session. (Hear, hear.) Now, however, we could get an answer when the members of the Administra-

tion had at length agreed among themselves upon the policy shadowed forth in this minute in Council of the 29th September; now, when they had been four months in power, during almost the whole of which time they had no formed policy on this subject which they could transmit to the Lower Provinces, at long last our Ministers agree to a policy, and put their opinions on paper. The hon. gentleman proceeded to point out the incorrectness of the statement in the minute, relative to the object of the Imperial Government in asking for a survey and sinking fund, arguing that the demand was only intended as a condition precedent to their going down to the House of Commons to ask for the guarantee. The Canadian Government, therefore, misrepresented the position of the Colonial Office in order to justify its own position and want of faith. (Hear.) Then this document assumed to rely on the document of the 25th February, as having conveyed the information to this House that the original basis of agreement had been abandoned; and also that if some details, if the old negotiation conducted in England by Hon. Messrs. Sicotte and Howland could be adjusted, the enterprise as agreed upon in the Conference of September, 1862, would go on. But the February report pronounced no opinion whatever as to the abandonment of the basis of September, 1862. On the contrary, it assumed throughout it might be induced to reconsider some of its objections and recall some of its propositions, and intimated as delicately as it could that some of the counter propositions of our delegates might be recalled. (Hear, hear.) Nor did it give a single hint that could be interpreted into an abandonment of the basis in question. Moreover, it concluded with the expression of a strong hope that the negotiations might yet be carried to a successful termination. The present Order in Council endeavoured to justify itself by putting the notification of the abandonment of the negotiations in the mouth of the minute of February, 1862; but it did not dare to quote a single sentence in proof. He thought it would be news to some hon. members like himself, who at that day were in the Government, that they had recorded a minute of Council

communicated to the Lower Provinces, which would justify them in assuming that our Government had abandoned its own act of the previous September.

Hon. Mr. GALT—Was this minute of February, 1863, communicated to the Governments of the Lower Provinces?

Hon. Mr. McGEE replied in the affirmative. They distinctly understood that it recognised the old basis, and authorised a survey, everything going to show they understood the very contrary to the scheme being abandoned. He thought it was much to be regretted this minute of September 29th had been adopted, as the character of Her Majesty's Ministers in Canada must suffer both in the Lower Provinces and in England—much to be regretted for the honour of this country. (Hear, hear.) A more disingenuous piece of special pleading he had never read; and it was because he had a real desire that our countrymen along the Bay of Fundy and the Gulf should not have a low opinion of this country, that our Government should not be considered a pack of tricksters, and that Canada should maintain unsullied her public faith, that he condemned the parties responsible for this document, and desired to see our Cabinet take a more honest and dignified course than in the matter under consideration. If at any time Government should find it necessary to abandon a particular policy, which it had ratified in a manner partaking of the nature of a solemn contract or treaty, it ought to do so frankly and officially, and at the earliest possible moment. He had no objection, if Government was opposed to any measure, to their getting up frankly and saying so, and would not have objected if they had stated they did not consider the former negotiations binding, and that the whole thing was abandoned; but if they felt so, let them not ask \$20,000 for a survey to enable themselves to gain time, while simultaneously they seek to place the responsibility of rejecting the scheme on the Lower Provinces in an unfair and disingenuous manner.\*

\* After some further discussion of a conversational kind, the concurrence was taken, without dividing the House.

## STATE OF THE COUNTRY: PUBLIC DEFENCES.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, QUEBEC, OCTOBER 13TH, 1863.

On the last day of the session, the question being on the third reading of the Militia and Volunteer Militia Bills—

Mr. McGEE said—Before the question is put, Mr. Speaker, I desire to address the House for the last time this session, when it may be proper to do so, on the subject of the state of the defences, provided for, in some sort, in these bills, and the other subject inseparably connected with our defence; the situation in which, when we quit Quebec, we shall leave the Government of the country. (Hear, hear.) I think, Sir, it must be admitted by every one at all attentive to our politics during the present year of grace, that one of our greatest weaknesses is the present Government of the country. (Hear, hear.) No doubt there are other vulnerable points of attack in our position, but so long as we may have a strong Government—a Government acceptable to, and fairly representing all classes and sections of the population—a Government thoroughly masters of the hearty, unbought allegiance of the people they govern, the main basis of all defence may be considered in our possession. Now, have we such a Government, so essential to the effective administration of this new Militia code, so soon as it becomes law? (Hear, hear.) On quitting Quebec, after voting for these measures—after voting the large expenditure necessary to put them in operation—do we feel assured, can we assure our constituents, that we have taken the best possible means for the preservation of Canada's independence, so long as the



greatest danger of all remains unremedied—a weak Government, existing by sufferance, at the mercy, from day to day, of the caprice of two or three individuals? (Hear, hear.) Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the final passage of both the bills now before you, not that I consider this Militia Bill the best or the fittest measure for Canada—not because I think the Volunteer Bill one which will satisfy, or could be expected to satisfy, the Volunteers of this country—(hear, hear)—but because I regard this Government as merely a Provisional Government. (Cheers and counter cheers.) It can be considered in no other light, with its majorities of one, two, and three. (Cheers.) And because, though it is a great misfortune to a country to have a merely *ad interim* Government in critical times, yet provision must be made, means and machinery must be provided for some degree of defence, even under the immense disadvantage of placing them in the hands of such a Government. (Cheers.) I do not think in the present hands the country will get value for the money voted.

Mr. SCOBLE—Why do you vote it then?

Hon. Mr. McGEE—As a temporary provision. (Hear, hear.) But certainly not because I regard these Acts as embodying the best system, nor this Government as possessing the confidence of those who are to be called on to turn out under these Acts. (Cheers.) In vain we vote pay to militiamen, and clothing and arms to volunteers, if we cannot present to the world without, the spectacle of a Government calculated to inspire them with respect, and to our own people at home such a conduct of affairs as will enlist their cheerful and united co-operation in bearing the cost and performing the duties of this or any other system of Militia organisation. (Hear, hear.) It is necessary, most of all now, before we separate for the year, that some one should tell the truth plainly to the Government itself, that however weakly they may exult in the adroit management by which they have barely escaped defeat, day by day, since the first day of the session, at what sacrifices and surrenders of principle and public policy they themselves know, that, however they might raise a cheer when the

clerk, in calling the division, counted one vote above a tie—that they have far less of the salutary confidence necessary to protect Canadian interests at this moment—at the close of the session—than they had even at the opening of the session. (Cheers, and cries of “No, no,” and “Yes, yes.”) It is necessary, then, to demonstrate this truth a little in detail, from the hour at which we are now arrived—the close of the second month we have spent, I will not say wasted, in Quebec—it is necessary for me to make good the rapid decadence of the political hopes formed of the Macdonald-Dorion combination of May last—hopes are formed alike of “new brooms” and new Governments—(laughter)—and this, Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavour to do in a very summary manner. It will be remembered by the House that the avowed object of the dissolution of May last was to enable the country, by electing a new Parliament, to remedy the inherent weakness which a too close balance of parties was found to have created in the last Parliament. (Hear, hear.) That was the avowed object—(hear, hear)—and what was the result? These strong men, strengthened with so many other strong men, making an election with all the advantages of their position, real, imaginary, present, and prospective—these strong men succeeded in splitting the country, east and west, with a diagonal line, throwing two-thirds of the east on one side and two-thirds of the west on the other. (Cheers.) They succeeded in giving us, as I predicted at the hustings of Montreal, “two compact sectional majorities,” and thus has this session staggered on, while Canada, like Issachar, “an ass between two burdens,” groaned under the twofold infliction. (Cheers.) Let us see how this engine has worked for the last two months, and judge if it can continue so to work? (Hear, hear.) It is, perhaps, indelicate to refer to the selection made of a candidate for the speakership at the commencement of the session, but a sense of justice compels me to say a word. I stated in the discussion which preceded that election my objections to the Ministerial proceedings, in presenting their actual Solicitor-General to that chair, and I am more and more confirmed

in the opinion that those objections were sound; but the election was not a party test. It was carried by eight votes, three of whom have since acted consistently with the Opposition—(hear, hear)—making a difference of six to be deducted from eight, if it had been a party vote. (Hear, hear.) But the choice was made, and I will take the liberty of adding, after the experience of the past two months, that I believe, Sir, your impartial conduct in the chair has justly entitled you to the respect and confidence of both sides of the House. (Hear, hear.) After the election came His Excellency's speech, which contained the programme of a full session. (Cries of "Hear, hear.") The programme of a full session,—though ministers in the very first debate took the extraordinary liberty of putting their own gloss on the speech, by declaring here, in their places, that they did not mean what His Excellency said—that all they wanted was a Militia Bill and Supply Bill. (Hear, hear.) In the Speech from the Throne we were assured that measures "interrupted by the dissolution" would be submitted to us; but we heard no more of those measures. (Hear, hear.) We were specifically promised in the Speech a Bankruptcy Bill,—but we have heard no more of that. (Hear, hear.) There was the Patent Law, the Civil Service Amendment Act—we heard no more of them. (Hear, hear.) Now it is, in my mind, Mr. Speaker, one among the things most to be avoided in our system—any weakening of the confidence of the country, in the utterances delivered from the Throne—any lessening of the *prestige* that surrounds the weakest of our "three estates." If it was never intended—as it appeared by the announcement of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government that it never had been intended—to stake their ministerial existence on any one of those measures, so solemnly promised to us, why put their idle and unintentional words in the mouth of His Excellency? (Hear, hear.) For my part, Sir, I rejoice to know that the representative of Her Majesty in this Province, as far as he has been known to the people, is personally and deservedly popular. (Hear, hear.) And it is the interest of every Canadian that the Chief Magistrate

should stand well with all classes of the people. The Government cannot be safe; the country cannot be safe, if it is otherwise, and therefore it is I lay the utmost strength on this bad example, of making the representative of the Sovereign responsible for official promises, which his advisers, through their want of nerve, or their want of support—it matters nothing which, when the mischief is done—never attempt to fulfil to the people. (Hear, hear.) As to the amendments to the Militia law promised in the Speech, and the hope then expressed that the House would receive those amendments in the proper spirit, I think it will be admitted, Mr. Speaker, that the House has shown the best spirit in the discussions which have taken place on that subject. (Hear, hear.) But, Mr. Speaker, let it be understood that every voice raised in advocacy of an improved and extended system of defence, except the Premier's, in introducing his amendments, came from the ranks of the Opposition. (Cheers, and cries of "Yes, yes," and "No, no," from the Ministerial benches.) Yes! the Premier in these discussions stood alone among his friends. (Cries of "Oh! oh!")

Hon. Mr. FOLEY—The hon. member for Lincoln assisted him. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. McGEHEE—Yes; I beg his pardon; I should not have forgotten the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. McGiverin). He certainly gave efficient aid, but all the rest of the Ministerial following voted in dumb show—(hear, hear)—while the hon. members for Kingston, for Montreal Centre, for Laval, and for Lennox and Addington, particularly distinguished themselves in those debates; and all four belonged to the Opposition. (Cheers.) If the Government had depended for party support to carry even the present measures, they know well they would have failed; they know well there are enough of their supporters hostile to all such legislation to leave them in a minority—two votes changed can do it any time—(laughter)—if the Opposition proper and the independent members had chosen to make a united stand against any one provision of these measures. (Opposition

cheers.) This fact every one knows, but the organs of the Administration will be careful not to mention it. (Laughter.) Now, as to the financial legislation promised us in His Excellency's speech, what had become of that? We were promised——

The Hon. J. S. MACDONALD here rose to a question of order. He wanted to know if the hon. gentleman was speaking to the question?

Mr. SPEAKER would read to the hon. member the rule on the subject, leaving it to himself to make the application.

The rule having been read,

Hon. Mr. MCGEE resumed.—I am much obliged to you, Mr. Speaker, for reminding me of the rule, and I shall endeavour to adhere as rigidly to it as possible. (Hear, hear.) Certainly, it seems to me a most important consideration for the security of Canada, whether we have a strong Government or a weak one, a popular or an unpopular Administration. (Hear, hear.) Notwithstanding these excursions, I hope, before I sit down, to make the matter pertinent enough to the direct question—our public defences. (Hear, hear.) When, then, Sir, as I was about to say, we were instructed in the Speech to give our attention to bringing “the expenditure of the country within its income”—we all, in our simplicity, supposed that the Finance Minister was to bring us here some project of taxation—some skeleton of a tariff—to effect that object. He alone could bring it, but, again, the promise implied in the Speech was violated. (Hear, hear.) Moreover, there was a paragraph in the Speech which even the hon. gentleman (Hon. J. S. Macdonald) can, I suppose, see the relevancy of, in relation to our Atlantic and Pacific Telegraph Company, and its value as a “military work” to “the British American Provinces.” But what cares the hon. gentleman for British America? (Hear, hear.) He would far rather give his leisure to acting as his own whipper-in. (Laughter.) A whipper-in is a necessary Parliamentary agent, an office all very well for a junior member; but a Prime Minister who is his own whipper-in is hardly likely to trouble his head

much about anything concerning the consolidation of British America. (Cheers.) I now distinctly charge the hon. gentleman and his colleagues with having, from whatever motives, so entangled and embroiled the Intercolonial Railway negotiations with the Lower Provinces, that they have not only sought to get rid of the basis agreed on at Quebec, in September, 1862, but they have got rid of the survey they themselves proposed, and for which, one week ago, we voted the proximate sum of \$20,000. (Repeated cries of "Hear, hear.") That charge I distinctly make, and I intend to move for documents which I believe to be in existence, which will establish that charge; I do not hesitate to say, these proofs which exist, must, when published, do great damage to this country's credit and character. (Hear, hear.)

AN HON. MEMBER—What has that to do with the Militia. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. McGEE—Everything. If we are to have a system of defence all the year round, it is most essential to know how we are to get to the sea five months of the year. (Cheers.) If we are to defend ourselves, or be defended from England, we must stand well in England, from which we must derive "war's two main hinges—iron and gold."

AN HON. MEMBER—Whose is that? (Laughter.)

Hon. Mr. McGEE—The phrase is Milton's, who had it from Machiavelli, who may have had it, as was popularly supposed, from "Old Nick." (Laughter.) One of the two hinges, at least, of all defence, we must derive from England, and that will depend on the exhibit our "sturdy beggar"—the phrase is his own, not mine—I mean the Minister of Finance, may make in England. (Hear, hear.) Now, we will imagine the hon. Minister, safely arrived at London, in search of his four millions loan (including \$900,000 for defences), and, though lost in the crowd for a moment, we will imagine him emerging into the very sanctuary of British credit. He will find before him merchants who know how to unite the large knowledge of statesmen with the keenest attention to their own interests, and men not

altogether ignorant of what has passed, and is passing, in Canada. Imagine the hon. gentleman indicating to such men the grounds for future loans to Canada by saying, "Our Government went to the country last June, and we estimated our expected majority at 20 or 25, but, unfortunately, we found, when the House met, that we had two *ties* the first week. However, we did our best to strengthen ourselves by seating in the House a private person (Mr. Rankin) as member for Essex. In this, unfortunately, we failed. A week later we underwent the ordeal of a want of confidence motion, and narrowly escaped by a majority of three in a full House. Immediately, seeing that something should be done, we took the mover of that motion—a distinguished member of the House—and made a Judge of him. (Cheers and laughter.) The ungrateful people of his constituency, however, not seeing their duty in that light, sent us in his stead a determined Oppositionist (Mr. Raymond). So we made nothing by giving the Judgeship; still we think the ingenuity displayed entitles our Government to great consideration in England—*pray, lend us four millions!*" (Laughter.) Imagine the hon. gentleman further explaining away the conduct of his Government in the Intercolonial negotiations, and being obliged to say, for the truth will be in England before him—it will stand in his path by the Mersey and the Thames—"It is true we proposed a survey to the Lower Provinces and the Colonial Secretary, and that both parties accepted our proposal; it is true, we went through the mockery of voting an item of \$20,000 for that survey, and naming a surveyor; but we found so many of our western supporters adverse to it, that we subsequently invented conditions which compelled the Lower Provinces to decline going on, and the Colonial Office to recall their engineer, for which specimen of our good faith we think you ought to put confidence in us—*can you lend us four millions?*" (Renewed laughter.) Nor, Mr. Speaker, will the well-known circumstances attendant on the last vote in this House (Mr. Galt's) fail to be understood in England? It will be seen at once by the observant politicians and capitalists of

England that this is not really the hon. gentleman's Government, but the Government of any one or two men who, on any test question, happen to have the toothache or the rheumatism, to stay away, or to put up their price. (Cheers and laughter.) The moral confidence of the country in this Administration is utterly gone, and if there were to be a general election to-morrow, not the city of Montreal alone, but the whole country, would sweep them away like a drift of dry leaves before the October blast. (Cheers.) In six months of administration you have destroyed every hold you ever had on the hearts of the people—those brave hearts, whether French, English, Scotch, or Irish, without whose confidence you will build up paper defences all in vain. (Hear.) This fact, too, will be known right well in England, as the hon. gentleman will find, when he gets there, seeking for his four millions, and pleading that \$900,000 of it is for defence. To make the country secure and strong—to inspire with respect our enemies, if we have enemies—we must have a strong Government, and an honest Government. (Hear, hear.) I accept these bills now to be read for the third time, ~~not~~ because they are the best possible Militia legislation, ~~but~~ because they are the best we can get from this Provisional Government. But will you go on ruling the country with a majority of one, two, or three? Will you weaken, and expose, and imperil the country by such a course, at such a time? Or do you expect, by private bartering with individual members, to win over, during the recess, one, or two, or three more? In Lower Canada—who is the Lower Canadian traitor who can face his constituents wearing your livery? (Cheers.) It is, Mr. Speaker, some satisfaction to many members, like myself, who do not desire the restoration to office of the old coalition (hear, hear), and who just as little desire the continuance in office of the hon. gentlemen now in power (hear, hear), that in quitting Quebec we have made some improvements, to say the least, on the existing Militia law; while, at the same time, every member of this House, not in the trammels of the Administration, must know and feel, that the prime want of our



military as of our civil strength—the cardinal want of a strong Government—must be supplied—or we must continue to see the credit and character of Canada suffer, governed, as she has been governed, by majorities made up of two or three votes, obtained, as they have been obtained, under our own eyes, from the 13th of August last to the present moment. (Loud cheers.)

## INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY DIPLOMACY.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, QUEBEC, MARCH 10TH, 1864.

MR. MCGEE, in rising to move the motion, of which he had given notice the first day of the session, for the production of papers in relation to the Intercolonial Railway and Survey negotiations, said: I have already, Mr. Speaker, expressed my conviction—in the debate on the Address—that the recent negotiations as to the Intercolonial Railway and Survey, I had reason to fear were not conducted in a manner creditable to this country, and I have now before me on this desk the most melancholy proofs that that conviction was well founded. (Hear, hear.) As the most frequent and sustained, and by far the ablest and most important correspondence that has ever arisen among these Provinces themselves, the series of papers sent down to us last Session, and those sent to the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick Houses now sitting, deserve the careful review of every member of this House. An article of the organ of the Administration of this day, denouncing the portion of that correspondence sustained by His Excellency Governor Gordon of New Brunswick, as “petulant,” “ignorant,” “foolish,” and “absurdly untrue”—what I cannot but call an audacious article—setting a very bad example in the tone of speaking of persons in His Excellency’s position—a tone I should be very sorry to see adopted towards our own Governor-General—gives a very immediate importance to this correspondence to which I now entreat the attention of the House. (Hear, hear.) It will be remembered that the date of the last paper, in the return sent down to us last October, was September 8th. There was, indeed, another paper, the Canadian Memorandum of Sep-

tember 29th, read in this House, irregularly, and without due consideration, as I think, by the Hon. Premier the very day of its adoption, but it is not yet formally before this House.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD—It was sent that day by mail.

Hon. Mr. McGEE—Sent by mail! (Hear, hear.) That is the way we treat our allies in the other Colonies. (Hear, hear.) The Nova Scotia return includes the paper of September 29th, however, and brings down the series to the Canadian Memorandum of December 20th, while the New Brunswick return, which reached us only yesterday, gives us all the subsequent papers, down to the Order in Council appointing Mr. Sandford Fleming on the 20th February last—the day after the meeting of Parliament, observe—to make the entire survey on Canada's "own responsibility and at our sole expense"—and the acknowledgment of that step made by New Brunswick, under date February 29th,—only ten days ago. Now, unless our Government has something behind, something which it has not communicated to the other Provinces—and the negotiation being in common, I presume that all the important documents are in possession of all the parties alike,—we have thus, the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches have in their hands the means of refuting, or we of establishing, the most serious charge that can be made against any Government, that is, the violation of its plighted, public faith. (Hear, hear.) I have read, Mr. Speaker, every line of these Intercolonial papers,—I have read some of them for the first time within the last twenty-four hours,—and although it is no pleasure to me to enjoy a personal or party triumph over the hon. gentlemen, I cannot for the sake of the great public interest at stake, refrain from repeating my full conviction that our part in the recent correspondence is not very creditable to Canada, nor such as to establish the good faith of our Government in the entire transaction. (Hear, hear.) When in the Lower Provinces last vacation, I maintained, publicly and privately, the good faith of the delegation to England, and the Govern-

ment that sent them there; I maintain so still; but it does now seem to me, from a careful review of the whole series of these papers, that the new line adopted by the new Canadian Government,—in which one of those delegates and four of the former Government now hold seats,—was sufficient to throw a retrospective shadow of uncertainty over the entire good faith, even of the delegates themselves. (Hear, hear.) The other Provinces would naturally say, when objections such as the sinking fund, peculiar to Canada, were started to the common project; when a survey to facilitate the project in its latest form was proposed, and when that joint-survey was declined by us unless the project itself was to be considered by all parties as obsolete and at an end;—the other Provinces, seeing these windings and turnings taken within twelve months under the lead of the same Prime Minister, with several of the same colleagues, would naturally say, "What faith can be placed on the stability, what reliance can be placed in the promises, of these Canadians?" I say that was a very natural conclusion for the other Provinces to arrive at; and that it has taken full possession of their minds, I need only refer to the very marked letters of Lieutenant-Governor Gordon to His Excellency Lord Monck, especially the letters of the 7th and 27th October last. These letters, we learn from this New Brunswick return, "received the approval" of the Duke of Newcastle, and whenever they are read, I have no doubt they will be admired for their high-spirited assertion of the obligations resting on all the Provincial Governments as to this negotiation, and the vigorous English in which they are expressed. If I particularise these, and some other papers, it is not, I repeat, from any satisfaction I feel in the discussion; it is not to answer the insolent aspersions of the *Mercury* of to-day; it is not to fasten conviction on the hon. gentlemen; but it is to turn the light of the past upon the present,—it is with a hope, however extravagant, so to fasten public attention on this Inter-colonial diplomacy, that it may not be possible hereafter for any Canadian Administration, if any such could be found, to play the double game at Halifax or Fredericton,

in the name of Canada, without being called to answer for it to the Parliament of Canada. (Cheers.) I must say a word here on behalf of a gentleman who has shown throughout these negotiations signal temper and ability. I mean my friend, Mr. Tilley, of New Brunswick, on whom the organs of our Administration have endeavoured to throw the entire responsibility of delaying the Survey. (Hear, hear.) Now, the fact is, as these documents show beyond a shadow of doubt, none of the negotiators has been more anxious than Mr. Tilley—as certainly no one of the Provinces is more at stake than New Brunswick—in this undertaking. The accident of politics threw Mr. Howe out of public life for the moment in his own Province, soon after the return of the joint delegation from England, and the Imperial Government—(I am sure every British American will rejoice at it)—having provided an honourable retreat for Mr. Howe, in the Imperial office of Fishery Commissioner, this Nova Scotian revolution—by which, whatever his programme may have been, I cannot but feel that our provincial politics have lost one of their foremost exponents,—this change, I say, naturally forced Mr. Tilley into the foreground in the maintenance of the Quebec compact of September, 1862. Mr. Tilley has performed his part, in my judgment, with great ability, and an extraordinary command of temper; and when the great project has succeeded, as succeed some good day it will, to no man can it be more indebted than to Mr. Tilley, for having nursed it through the most critical period of its existence. (Hear, hear.) Now, Sir, to return to this curious correspondence. The last document brought down to us was, the House remembers, the Memorandum of our Council, read here on the 29th September, the day of its adoption, in vindication of the Premier, by himself, and before it could be communicated to the other parties. That proceeding I then thought, and still think, irregular and disorderly; but let that pass. The document, however, I may observe, *en passant*, is signed in these papers (*N. B. Series*, p. 18), “J. S. McD.”—and not, as is our Canadian custom, by the Clerk

of the Council. What that means, if it means anything, I am unable to say, but I call to it the attention of the other hon. members of the Government now in the House. (Hear, hear.) Now, the first discovery which the Lower Provinces seem to have made of the existence of a double influence in our Council, finds expression in a despatch of Governor Gordon to the Duke of Newcastle, in August last, and is thus enlarged upon in his subsequent despatch of the 28th September:—"The Provincial Secretary of this Province, Hon. S. L. Tilley, together with the Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia, were at that time on their way to Quebec for the purpose of arranging the details connected with the commencement of the Survey; and I felt that on their learning what was said to have fallen from Mr. Dorion, they might probably be disposed to abandon further negotiation. This, it appeared to me, would be exactly that which would be most desired by the Canadian Government, supposing them to be anxious to escape from their obligations; and I accordingly wrote to Mr. Tilley to the effect that, whilst I thought that, if the Canadian Government as a body repudiated the engagements of September, 1862, or refused to bear five-twelfths of the expenses of the Survey, he would have no alternative but to refuse to take any further step, and should return here immediately; yet, on the other hand, I saw advantages in pledging the Canadian Cabinet *to the practical adoption of the share of expenditure contemplated in the original agreement*, and urged that the arrangements should proceed so long as it was possible to assume that the Government of Canada intended, as a Government, to respect the engagements into which it had entered." (*N.B. Series, page 14.*)—This despatch, observe, was sent off to Downing Street after Mr. Tilley's return from Quebec to Frederickton, while we were yet sitting here, and were assured that all His Excellency's advisers were fully agreed on their Intercolonial policy. (Hear, hear.) Yet what do we find Governor Gordon officially stating to the Duke of Newcastle on Mr. Tilley's report—that he found some of the Canadian Ministers "*absolutely repudiating*, and others hesitating, to acknowledge the

obligations of September, 1862,"—a very dubious position, as the Lower Province statesmen inevitably felt. The Memorandum of the 29th September, read in this House by the Premier, intended to define the exact position, at that time, of the Canadian Cabinet, was communicated to New Brunswick, and drew from Governor Gordon the remarkable letter to Lord Monck, of October 7th, which formally inaugurated "the good faith" controversy—a controversy which seems ended only by Mr. Fleming's appointment, ten days ago, and the gleam of sunshine which now seems to have fallen upon the path of the project—or, at least, upon the prospect of the project. I shall not go into the particulars of the good faith discussion, in which we find His Excellency compelled by the exigencies of the case to defend his own honour, while endeavouring to justify his advisers; in which we find questions—amounting almost to questions of veracity—raised between these high officers administering these neighbouring Governments; questions which never ought to have been raised, never could have been raised, if a weak spirit, unable to wield, and unable to resign office, had not presided in the Executive Council, and led the deliberations of this House, with a pitiful salvage of one per cent. of its members. (Cheers.) When our own return plaques the papers I have quoted from the New Brunswick official return in the hands of all the members of this House (the return for which I am now moving), I shall be prepared, if necessary, to go into every detail of that ingenious series of expedients—the gain-time-at-any-price-policy, pursued by the present Administration towards the sister Provinces. (Hear, hear.) I shall content myself to-day with calling attention to one other fact involved in these Nova Scotia and New Brunswick documents. The House will remember that last year our Government would not go on with the joint Survey, of which we were then to pay five-twelfths only, unless Nova Scotia and New Brunswick expressly renounced the Quebec compact of September, 1862. Well, what are we doing now? We are now going on with it at "*our sole expense*," though neither of

the Lower Provinces have made any act of renunciation. So far from it, that the last document of the Series now before me, the Minute of the New Brunswick Council of the 29th of February, ten days ago, transmitted the same day to our Government, expressly reserves to that Province the right to reject altogether the survey now so unconditionally undertaken by Canada. "The Committee," says this minute, "wish it to be distinctly understood that the Government of New Brunswick are not to be considered in any way necessarily committed to the conclusions at which Mr. Fleming may arrive. Any survey, to be binding upon them, must be conducted according to the terms of the Act passed at the last session of the Legislature of New Brunswick, authorising the construction of the Intercolonial Railway." So that we lost a year, and the surveyor lost a season, in seeking for a renunciation which is now abandoned, and in higgling over our proportion of an expenditure of which we have at length undertaken the whole! (Hear, hear.) This is, in short, the sum and substance of the negotiations of the last year and a-half, conducted on our part under the auspices of the present head of the Administration. (Hear, hear.) It is, so far as Canada is concerned, divisible into two parts, that part maintained from September, 1862, to May, 1863, by the Macdonald-Sicotte Ministry, and that party since maintained by the Macdonald-Dorion Ministry. The question of good faith arises only with the latter, for although the delegation to England was our work, I utterly deny that there was any understanding, tacit or explicit, that the basis of the Quebec compact was abandoned during our time. These papers bear me fully out in that denial. It was from an announcement made in his speech on the opening of this House, in August last, by the Hon. Attorney-General East (Mr. Dorion), as is shown by Governor Gordon's despatch of the 29th of that month to the Duke of Newcastle, that the Lower Provinces took alarm, and that New Brunswick took up the gauntlet for plighted faith and Intercolonial honour. (Hear, hear.) Nova Scotia has not been equally forward, because Nova Scotia has been under an Administration *ad interim* for



several months, and her new Cabinet are busied about their new policy. But, so far as she has given it, the testimony of Nova Scotia, as to past transactions, is entirely with New Brunswick, and against us, as having unworthily defeated the project.

Hon. Mr. BROWN.—The best thing they ever did. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. MCGEE.—The best thing they ever did! I regret to hear the hon. member for South Oxford express so shocking a sentiment—that the best thing a Government ever did was to meet in conference with two other Provinces to sign an agreement, and then violate that agreement without meeting Parliament or putting the question to a test. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Speaker, I fear, I deeply and sincerely fear, that the conduct of our Government has inflicted a blow on the vitals of this project, which even Mr. Fleming and his theodolite cannot cure. I received but yesterday—by the same mail that brought us these papers—a letter from a valued friend, a member of the Nova Scotian Assembly (not a Minister), a letter, in which he says:—"The Intercolonial is as dead as a door-nail—Canada killed it." I trust my good friend the writer, whom I have no objection to name—Mr. Tobin, member for Halifax—is mistaken, but I fear for the worst. I fear we have not only killed it, but that, by our evil Ministry, we have forced into existence a brood of local projects in both Provinces, which will divide their councils, and devour their substance, for many a day to come. (Hear, hear.) I say here deliberately, and in possession of as full information from below as Ministers themselves have, if this chance of a Canadian outlet to the sea through British territory is for long, or for ever, closed against us, an awful responsibility rests upon His Excellency's present advisers. (Hear, hear.) Will despatching Mr. Fleming in rude haste to head-waters of the Restigouche, or the valley of the Tobique, restore the project to where it stood, in the list of possibilities, twelve months ago? I say it will not—it cannot. If our Government really means to restore the project to the region of reality, let them legislate. Let

them introduce a bill authorising either the Quebec terms, or a sum not exceeding a certain amount to be devoted to this enterprise, with a proviso concerning the result of the survey. This would look like business—this would look like good faith—and for this action, and less will not save the project, there is still abundant time left, if our Ministers really desire to do something practical, to reassure and regain the place we have lost in the confidence of the Maritime Provinces and the Home Government. There are, I shall never cease to repeat it, some 800,000 of our fellow-countrymen between us and the Atlantic—there is wanting an iron link of 350 to 400 miles to connect us with our countrymen, the Atlantic, and the rest of the Empire. It is a great project, and never can be carried without courage and firmness on the part of the several Provinces. Canada, the leading Province in every other respect, ought to be the leader in point of enterprise; and it is, therefore, that I urge upon Ministers—promising them my humble support for any such measure—to go a step beyond the mere appointment of a Surveyor, and to give us, and all concerned in the result, a Parliamentary guarantee for our Provincial good faith in this undertaking. If you refuse some such guarantee, after all that has happened, I repeat, you will not remove, but confirm suspicion—you will not revive, but you will still more deeply bury your project;—you will remove it from the dead-house, only to lay it finally in its grave. (Hear, hear.) I have spoken of a brood of projects which have sprung up, in the Lower Provinces, on the fall of the Intercolonial:—

“ For many have sprung from the one lying low,  
Like twigs from the felled forest tree ”.—

but I must except one project, which reflects the greatest credit on all the parties—to which we, in Canada, cannot be indifferent. Laying aside all partisan and personal considerations, the leading spirits of the Lower Provinces, not fearing to venture into broader channels than their own internal politics afford—have simultaneously proposed to reunite Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the Island of

Prince Edward—into one great maritime community—with one tariff, one treasury, and one legislature. (Hear, hear.) It is impossible not to admire the superiority to mere sectionalism exhibited in this proposal, and I, for one, humbly and sincerely pray to God, that for their own sakes, and for our sake, they may succeed, and the sooner the better. (Hear, hear.) I could have wished, as I have always advocated, that steps might, ere this, have been taken for the initiation of the larger union of all the Provinces; but if we are just now barren of the wise and generous spirit of compromise that seeks to restore the ancient Acadia to its old integrity, we can have at least the modest merit of admiring in others what we may not possess within ourselves. (Cheers.) This will be a union—unlike our existing union—brought about by the internal action of the sections themselves, with the sanction of the Crown; it will be a union unheralded by any great civil commotion—and one, which it is not presumptuous to foretell, that will consecrate the memory of its authors to lasting remembrance. (Cheers.) I could not forbear, Mr. Speaker, since reading the respective speeches of the Governors of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, from expressing my hearty admiration of the wise prevision they exhibit in this recommendation, and in adding my humble hope, as a Canadian representative, that the auspicious union they now have proposed may go on to a most fortunate fruition.

The hon. gentleman concluded by moving for the returns of which he had given notice on the first day of the Session.

SPEECH ON MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS TO  
HER MAJESTY IN FAVOUR OF CON-  
FEDERATION.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9TH, 1865.

THE order of the day for resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed Address to Her Majesty, on the subject of the Confederation of the British North American Provinces, having been called—

Mr. McGEE said :—Mr. Speaker, I rise to endeavour to fulfil the promise made in my name last evening by the Lower Canadian leader of this House. After the four speeches that have already been delivered from this quarter of the House, it may very well be supposed that little of essential importance remains to be said.. On Monday the Attorney-General West, in exposing the case for the Government, in moving this Address to Her Majesty, went very fully through all the items of the resolutions agreed upon at the Quebec Conference, and gave us a full analysis of the whole project, with his own constitutional commentaries upon the proceedings of that body. On the next evening, the Attorney-General East gave us his views also, treating chiefly of the difficulties in the way of union in Lower Canada. The same night, my honourable friend, the Minister of Finance, gave us a financial view of the whole subject ; and last evening the Hon. President of the Council gave us another extended financial and political address, with some arguments from "the Upper Canadian point of view," as the phrase is. It may well, therefore, seem that after these speeches little of essential importance remains to be stated. Still this subject is so vast, the project before

the House is so vast, and comprehends within it so many objects of interest, the atmosphere that surrounds a subject of this importance is so subtle and fluctuating, that there may be, I am fain to believe, a little joiner-work still left to do—there may be a *hiatus* here and there to fill up; and although, as far as what is called “the preliminary case” is concerned, the question might perhaps very well have rested with the four speeches already delivered, there may be some slight additional contribution made, and, such as it is, in my own humble way, I propose to make it to-night. We all remember that in the nursery legend of the *Three Kings of Cologne*, Caspar brought myrrh, and Melchior incense, and Baltassar gold, but I am afraid my contribution will be less valuable than any of these, yet such as it is I cheerfully bring it, particularly when there are so many in this and the other provinces who would like to know what my own views are in the present position of the general question.

With your approbation, Sir, and the forbearance of the House, I will endeavour to treat this subject in this way:—First, to give some slight sketch of the history of the question; then to examine the existing motives which ought to prompt us to secure a speedy union of these provinces; then to speak of the difficulties which this question has encountered before reaching its present fortunate stage; then to say something of the mutual advantages, in a social rather than political point of view, which these provinces will have in their union;—and, lastly, to add a few words on the Federal principle in general; when I shall have done. In other words, I propose to consider the question of Union mainly from within, and, as far as possible, to avoid going over the ground already so fully and so much better occupied by hon. friends who have already spoken upon the subject.

My hon. friend, the member for Hochelaga, thought he did a very clever thing, the other evening, when he disinterred an old newspaper article of mine, entitled “A New Nationality,” and endeavoured to fix on me the paternity of the phrase—destined to become prophetic—which was

employed by a very distinguished personage, in the Speech from the Throne, at the opening of the Session. I do happen to remember the article alluded to as one of my first essays in political writing in Canada; but I am quite sure that the almost-forgotten publication in which it appeared was never known, even by name, to the illustrious person who delivered the speech on that occasion. But I will own, when I saw my bantling held up to the admiration of the House in the delicate and fostering hands of the hon. member for Hochelaga, I was not ashamed of it; on the contrary, perhaps, there was some tingling of parental pride when I saw what, ten years ago, I pointed out as the true position for these colonies to take, likely to be adopted by all the colonies under such favourable circumstances. I do not think it ought to be made a matter of reproach to me, or a cause for belittling the importance of the subject, that, ten years ago, I used the identical phrase employed in the Speech from the Throne. The idea itself is a good one, and it may have floated through the minds of many men, and received intellectual hospitality even from the honourable member for Hochelaga himself. One is reminded by this sort of thing of Puff in the *Critic*. "Two people happened," Puff says, "to hit upon the same thought, and Shakspeare made use of it first—that's all." My honourable friend in this respect may be the Shakspeare of the new nationality. If there is anything in the article he has read to the House which is deserving of disapprobation, he is *particeps criminis*, and equally blameable, if not more blameable, than myself. He is, indeed, the older offender, and I bow to him in that character with all proper humility. Really, Mr. Speaker, the attempt to fix the parentage of this child of many fathers, is altogether absurd and futile. It is almost as ridiculous as the attempt to fix the name of this new Confederation, in advance of the decision of the Gracious Lady to whom the matter is to be referred. I have read in one newspaper, published in a western city, not less than a dozen attempts of this nature. One individual chooses Tuponia, and another Hochelaga, as a suitable name for the new nationality. Now, I would ask any

honourable member of this House how he would feel if he woke up some fine morning, and found himself, instead of a Canadian, a Tuponian or Hochelagander? (Laughter.) I think we may leave, for the present, the discussion of the name as well as the origin of the new system proposed: when the Confederation has a place among the nations of the world, and opens a new page in history, it will be time enough to look into its antecedents; and when it has reached that stage, there are a few men who, having struggled for it in its earlier difficulties, will then deserve to be honourably mentioned. I shall not be guilty of the bad taste of personally complimenting those with whom I have the honour to be associated; but when we reach the stage of research, which lies far beyond the stage of decision in these affairs, there are some names that ought not to be forgotten.

*Mr. Newman, and*  
 So far back as the year 1800, the Hon. Mr. Uniacke, a leading politician in Nova Scotia at that date, submitted a scheme of Colonial Union to the Imperial authorities. In 1815, Chief Justice Sewell, whose name will be well remembered as a leading lawyer of this city, and a far-sighted politician, submitted a similar scheme. In 1822, Sir John Beverley Robinson, at the request of the Colonial Office, submitted a project of the same kind; and I need not refer to the report of Lord Durham, on Colonial Union, in 1839. These are all memorable, and some of them are great names. If we have dreamed a dream of Union (as some of you gentlemen say), it is at least worth while remarking that a dream which has been dreamed by such wise and good men, may, for aught we know, or you know, have been a sort of vision—a vision foreshadowing forthcoming natural events in a clear intelligence: a vision—I say it without irreverence, for the event concerns the lives of millions living, and yet to come—resembling those seen by the Daniels and Josephs of old, foreshadowing the trials of the future, the fate of tribes and peoples, the rise and fall of dynasties. But the immediate history of the measure is sufficiently wonderful, without dwelling on the remoter predictions of so many wise men. Whoever, in 1862, or

even in 1863, would have told us that we should see even what we see in these seats by which I stand—such a representation of interests acting together, would be accounted, as our Scotch friends say, “half daft;” and whoever, in the Lower Provinces about the same time, would have ventured to foretell the composition of their delegations which sat with us under this roof last October, would probably have been considered equally demented. (Laughter.) But the thing came about; and if those gentlemen who have had no immediate hand in bringing it about, and, therefore, naturally felt less interest in the project than we who had, will only give us the benefit of the doubt—will only assume that we are not all altogether wrong-headed—we hope to show them still farther, though we think we have already shown them satisfactorily, that we are by no means without reason in entering on this enterprise. I submit, however, we may very well dismiss the antecedent history of the question for the present: it grew from an unnoticed feeble plant, to be a stately and flourishing tree; and, for my part, any one that pleases may say he made the tree grow, if I can only have hereafter my fair share of the shelter and the shade. (Cheers.) But in the present stage of the question, the first real stage of its success—the thing that gave importance to theory in men’s minds—was the now celebrated despatch, signed by two members of this Government and an honourable gentleman formerly their colleague (Hon. Mr. Ross), a member of the other House. I refer to the despatch of 1858. The recommendations in that despatch lay dormant until revived by the Constitutional Committee of last Session, which led to the Coalition, which led to the Quebec Conference, which led to the draft of the Constitution now on our table, which will lead, I am fain to believe, to the union of all these provinces. (Hear, hear.) At the same time that we mention the distinguished politicians, I think we ought not to forget those zealous and laborious contributors to the public press, who, although not associated with governments, and not themselves at the time in politics, yet greatly contributed to give life and interest to this question, and, indi-



rectly, to bring it to the happy position in which it now stands. Of those gentlemen I will mention two. I do not know whether honourable gentlemen of this House have seen some letters on Colonial Union, written in 1855—the last addressed to the late Duke of Newcastle—by Mr. P. S. Hamilton, an able public writer of Nova Scotia, and the present Gold Commissioner of that province; but I take this opportunity of bearing my testimony to his well-balanced judgment, political sagacity, and the skilful handling the subject received from him at a very early period. (Hear, hear.) There is another little book written in English, six or seven years ago; to which I must refer. It is a pamphlet, which met with an extraordinary degree of success, entitled *Nova Britannia*, by my honourable friend, the member for South Lanark (Mr. Morris); and as he has been one of the principal agents in bringing into existence the present Government, which is now carrying out the idea embodied in his book, I trust he will forgive me if I take the opportunity, although he is present, of reading a single sentence, to show how far he was in advance, and how true he was to the coming event which we are now considering. At page 57 of his pamphlet—which I hope will be reprinted among the political miscellanies of the provinces when we are one country and one people—I find this paragraph:—

“The dealing with the destinies of a future British empire, the shaping its course, the laying its foundations broad and deep, and the erecting thereon a noble and enduring superstructure, are indeed duties that may well evoke the energies of our people, and nerve the arms and give power and enthusiasm to the aspirations of all true patriots. The very magnitude of the interests involved, will, I doubt not, elevate many amongst us above the demands of mere sectionalism, and enable them to evince sufficient comprehensiveness of mind to deal in the spirit of real statesmen with issues so momentous, and to originate and develop a national line of commercial and general policy, such as will prove adapted to the wants and exigencies of our position.” (Hear, hear.)

There are many other excellent passages in the work, but I will not detain the House with many quotations. The spirit that animates the whole will be seen from the extract I have read.\* But whatever the private writer in his closet may have conceived, whatever even the individual statesman may have designed, so long as the public mind was uninterested in the adoption, even in the discussion of a change in our position so momentous as this, the Union of these separated Provinces, the individual laboured in vain—perhaps, Sir, not wholly in vain, for although his work may not have borne fruit then, it was kindling a fire that would ultimately light up the whole political horizon and herald the dawn of a better day for our country and our people. Events stronger than advocacy, events stronger than men, have come in at last like the fire behind the invisible writing to bring out the truth of these writings and to impress them upon the mind of every thoughtful man who has considered the position and probable future of these Provinces. (Cheers.) Before I go farther into the details of my subject, I will take this opportunity of congratulating this House and the public of all the Provinces upon the extraordinary activity of the provincial mind since this subject has become the leading-topic of discussion in the Maritime, and what I may call relatively to them, the Inland Provinces. It is astonishing how active intelligence has been in all these communities since the subject has been fairly launched. I have watched with great attention the expression of public opinion in the Lower Provinces as well as in our own; and I am rejoiced to find that even from the smallest of the Provinces I have read writings and speeches which would do no discredit to older and more cultivated communities—articles and speeches worthy of any press and of any audience. The provincial mind, it would seem, under the inspiration of a great question, leaped, at a single bound, out of the slough of mere mercenary struggles for office, and took post on the high and

\* Dr. J. C. Taché's excellent *brochure*, entitled "Des Provinces d'Amérique du Nord et d'une Union Fédérale," published at Quebec in 1858, also deserves honourable mention.

honourable ground from which alone this great subject can be taken in, in all its dimensions—they rose at once to the true dignity of this discussion with an elasticity that does honour to the communities that have exhibited it. (Cheers.) We find in the journals and in the speeches of public men in the Lower Provinces a discussion of the first principles of government, a discussion of the principles of constitutional law, and an intimate knowledge and close application of the leading facts in constitutional history, which gives to me at least the satisfaction and assurance that, if we never went a step farther in this matter, we have put an end for the present, and I hope for long, to bitterer and smaller controversies. We have given the people some sound mental food, and to every man who has a capacity for discussion we have given a topic upon which he can fitly exercise his powers, no longer gnawing at a file and wasting his abilities in the poor effort at advancing the ends of some paltry faction or party. I can congratulate this House and Province and the Provinces below; that such is the case, and I may add also, with satisfaction, that the various orators and writers seem speaking or writing as if in the visible presence of all the colonies. (Hear, hear.) They are no longer hole-and-corner celebrities: they seem to think that their words will be scanned and weighed afar off as well as at home. We have, I believe, several hundred celebrities in Canada—my friend, Mr. Morgan, I believe, has made out a list of them—(laughter)—but they are no longer now local celebrities; if celebrities at all they must be celebrities for British North America; for every one of the speeches made by them on this subject is watched in all the Provinces, and in point of fact by the mere appearance of political union, we have laid the lines of a mental union among the people of all these Provinces; and many men now speak with a comprehensiveness which formerly did not characterise them, when they were watched only by their own narrow and struggling section, and weighed only according to a stunted local standard. (Hear, hear). Federation, I hope, may supply to all our public men just ground for uniting in nobler and more profitable

contests than those which have signalised the past. (Hear, hear.) We, on this side, Mr. Speaker, propose for that better future our plan of Union; and, if you will allow me, I shall go over what appear to me the principal motives which exist at present for that Union. My hon. friend the Finance Minister mentioned the other evening several strong motives for union—free access to the sea, an extended market, breaking down of hostile tariffs, a more diversified field for labour and capital, our enhanced credit with England, and our greater effectiveness when united, for assistance in time of danger. (Cheers.) The Hon. President of the Council, last night also enumerated several motives for union in relation to the commercial advantages which will flow from it, and other powerful reasons which may be advanced in favour of it. But the motives to such a comprehensive change as we propose, must be mixed motives—partly commercial, partly military, and partly political; and I shall go over a few—nor strained or simulated—motives which must move many people of all these Provinces, and which are rather of a social, or strictly speaking, political, than of a financial kind. In the first place, I echo what was stated in the speech last night of my hon. friend, the President of the Council—that we cannot stand still; we cannot stave off some great change; we cannot stand alone—Province apart from Province—if we would; and that we are in a state of political transition. All, even honourable gentlemen who are opposed to this description of union, admit that we must do something, and that that something must not be a mere temporary expedient. We are compelled, by warning voices from within and without, to make a change and a great change. We all, with one voice who are Unionists, declare our conviction that we cannot go on as we have gone; but you, who are all anti-Unionists, say—"Oh! that is begging the question; you have not yet proved that." Well, Mr. Speaker, what proofs do the gentlemen want? I presume there are the influences which determine any great change in the course of any individual or State. First—His patron, owner, employer, protector, ally, or friend; or,

in our politics, "Imperial connection." Secondly—His partner, comrade, or fellow-labourer, or near neighbour; in our case, the United States. And, thirdly,—The man himself, or the Province itself. Now, all three have concurred to warn and force us into a new course of conduct. What are these warnings? We have had at least three. The first is from England, and is a friendly warning. England has warned us by several matters of fact, according to her custom, rather than verbiage, that the colonies had entered upon a new era of existence, a new phase in their career. She has given us this warning in several different shapes—when she gave us "Responsible Government"—when she adopted Free Trade—when she repealed the Navigation Laws—and when, three or four years ago, she commenced that series of official despatches in relation to militia and defence which she has ever since poured in on us, in a steady stream, always bearing the same solemn burthen—"Prepare! prepare! prepare!" These warnings gave us notice that the old order of things between the colonies and the mother country had ceased, and that a new order must take its place. (Hear, hear.) About four years ago, the first despatches began to be addressed to this country, from the Colonial Office, upon the subject. From that day to this there has been a steady stream of despatches in this direction, either upon particular or general points connected with our defence; and I venture to say, that if bound up together, the despatches of the lamented Duke of Newcastle alone would make a respectable volume—all notifying this Government, by the advices they conveyed, that the relations—the military apart from the political and commercial relations—of this Province to the mother country had changed; and we were told in the most explicit language that could be employed, that we were no longer to consider ourselves, in relation to defence, in the same position we formerly occupied towards the mother country. Well, these warnings have been friendly warnings; and if we have failed to do our part in regard to them, we must, at all events, say this, that they were addressed to our Government so continuously and so strenuously that they

freed the Imperial power of much responsibility for what ever might follow, because they showed to the colonies clearly what, in the event of certain contingencies arising, they had to expect. We may grumble or not at the necessity of preparation England imposes upon us, but, whether we like it or not, we have, at all events, been told that we have entered upon a new era in our military relations to the rest of the Empire. (Hear, hear.) Then, Sir, in the second place, there came what I may call the other warning from without—the American warning. (Hear, hear.) Republican America gave us her notices in times past, through her press, and her demagogues, and her statesmen, but of late days she has given us much more intelligible notices—such as the notice to abrogate the Reciprocity Treaty, and to arm the lakes, contrary to the provisions of the Convention of 1818. She has given us another notice in imposing a vexatious passport system; another in her avowed purpose to construct a ship canal round the falls of Niagara, so as “to pass war vessels from Lake Ontario to Lake Erie;” and yet another, the most striking one of all, has been given to us, if we will only understand it, by the enormous expansion of the American army and navy. I will take leave to read to the House a few figures which show the amazing, the unprecedented growth (which has not, perhaps, a parallel in the annals of the past), of the military power of our neighbours, within the past three or four years. I have the details here by me, but shall only read the results, to show the House the emphatic terms of this most serious warning. In January, 1861, the regular army of the United States, including of course the whole of the States, did not exceed 15,000 men. This number was reduced, from desertion and other causes, by 5,000 men, leaving 10,000 men as the regular army of the United States. In December, 1862, that is, from January, 1861, to January, 1863, this army of 10,000 was increased to 800,000 soldiers actually in the service. (Hear, hear.) No doubt there are exaggerations in some of these figures—the rosters were, doubtless, in some cases filled with fictitious names, in order to procure the bounties that were

offered; but if we allow two-thirds as correct, we find that a people who had an army of 10,000 men in 1861, had in two years increased it to an army of 600,000 men. As to their munitions and stock of war material at the opening of the war—that is to say, at the date of the attack upon Fort Sumter—we find that they had of siege and heavy guns 1,952; of field artillery, 231; of infantry firearms, 473,000; of cavalry firearms, 31,000; and of ball and shell, 363,000. At the end of 1863, the latest period to which I have statistics upon the subject, the 1,952 heavy guns had become 2,116; the 231 field pieces had become 2,965; the 473,000 infantry arms had become 2,423,000; the 31,000 cavalry arms had become 369,000; and the 363,000 ball and shell had become 2,925,000. Now as to the navy of the United States, I wish also to show that this wonderful development of war power in the United States is the second warning we have had, that we cannot go on as we have gone. (Hear, hear.) In January, 1861, the ships of war belonging to the United States were 83; in December, 1864, they numbered 671, of which 54 were monitors and iron-clads, carrying 4,610 guns, with a tonnage of 510,000 tons, and manned by a force of 51,000 men. These are frightful figures; frightful for the capacity of destruction they represent, for the heaps of carnage they represent, for the quantity of human blood spilt they represent, for the lust of conquest they represent, for the evil passions they represent, and for the arrest of the onward progress of civilisation they represent. But it is not the figures which give the worst view of the fact—for England still carries more guns afloat even than our well-armed neighbours. (Cheers.) It is the change which has taken place in the spirit of the people of the Northern States themselves which is the worst view of the fact. How far have they travelled since the humane Channing preached the unlawfulness of war—since the living Sumner delivered his addresses to the Peace Society on the same theme! I remember an accomplished poet, one of the most accomplished the New England States have ever produced, taking very strong grounds against the prosecution of the Mexican war, and published

the Bigelow Papers, so well known in American literature, to show the ferocity and criminality of war. That poet made Mr. Bird-o'-Freedom Sawin sing:

    If you take a soord an droar it,  
    An go stick a feller thru,  
    Guv'ment won't answer for it,  
    God'll send the bill to you!

(Laughter.) This was slightly audacious and irreverent in expression, but it was remarkably popular in New England at that time. The writer is now one of the editors of a popular Boston periodical, and would be one of the last, I have no doubt, to induce a Northern soldier to withdraw his sword from the body of any unhappy Southerner whom he had, contrary to the poet's former political ethics, "stuck thru." (Laughter.) But it is not the revolution wrought in the minds of men of great intelligence that is most to be deplored—for the powerful will of such men may compel their thoughts back again to a philosophy of peace; no, it is the mercenary and military interests created under Mr. Lincoln which are represented, the former by an estimated governmental outlay of above \$100,000,000 this year, and the other by the 800,000 men, whose blood is thus to be bought and paid for; by the armies out of uniform who prey upon the army in uniform; by the army of contractors who are to feed and clothe and arm the fighting million; by that other army, the army of tax-collectors, who cover the land, seeing that no industry escapes unburthened, no possession unentered, no affection even, untaxed. Tax! tax! tax! is the cry from the rear! Blood! blood! blood! is the cry from the front! Gold! gold! gold! is the chuckling undertone which comes up from the mushroom *millionaires*, well named a shoddy aristocracy. Nor do I think the army interest, the contracting interest, and the tax-gathering interest, the worst results that have grown out of this war. There is another and equally serious interest—the revolution in the spirit, mind, and principles of the people, that terrible change which has made war familiar and even attractive to them. When the first battle was fought—when, in the language of the Duke



of Wellington, the first "butcher's bill was sent in"—a shudder of horror ran through the length and breadth of the country; but by-and-by, as the carnage increased, no newspaper was considered worth laying on the breakfast table unless it contained the story of the butchery of thousands of men. "Only a thousand killed! Pooh, pooh, that's nothing!" exclaimed Mr. Shoddy, as he sipped his coffee in his luxurious apartment; and nothing short of the news of ten or fifteen thousand maimed or slain in a day could satisfy the jaded palate of men craving for excitement, and such horrible excitement as attends the wholesale murder of their fellow-creatures. Have these sights and sounds no warning addressed to us? Are we as those who have eyes and see not; ears and hear not; reason, neither do they understand? If we are true to Canada—if we do not desire to become part and parcel of this people—we cannot overlook this, the greatest revolution of our own times. Let us remember this, that when the three cries among our next neighbours are shoddy, taxation, blood, it is time for us to provide for our own security. I said in this House, during the session of the year 1861, that the first gun fired at Fort Sumter had "a message for us;" I was unheeded then; I repeat now that every one of the 2,700 great guns in the field, and every one of the 4,600 guns afloat, whenever it opens its mouth, repeats the solemn warning of England—Prepare! prepare! prepare! (Cheers.) But I may be told by some moralising friend, Oh! but when they get out of this, they will have had enough of it, and they will be very glad to rest on their laurels. They! Who? The Shoddy aristocracy have enough of it? The disbanded army of tax-gatherers have enough of it? The manufacturers of false intelligence have enough of it? Who is it probable will have had enough of it? The fighting men themselves? I dare say they would all like to have a furlough, but all experience teaches us, it is not of war soldiers' tire, but of peace; it is not of the sea sailors' tire, but of the land. Jack likes to land, and have a frolic and spend his money, so does Jack's brother the fighting landsman—but the one is soon as much out of his element as the other,

when parted from his comrades, when denied the gipsy joys of the camp, when he no longer feels his sword, he looks up to it where it hangs, and sighs to take it down and be "at work" again. He will even quit his native country, if she continues perversely peaceful, and go into foreign service, rather than remain what he calls "idle." (Hear.) This is experience, which I beg respectfully to cite in opposition to the seductive, disarming fallacy of my moralising friend. (Hear, hear.) The Attorney-General East told us in his speech the other night, that one of the articles of the original programme of the American Revolutionists was the acquisition of Canada to the United States. They pretend to underrate the importance of this country, now that they are fully occupied elsewhere; but I remember well that the late Mr. Webster, who was not a demagogue, at the opening of the Worcester and Albany Railway, some years since, expressed the hope that the railways of the New England States would all point towards Canada, because their influence and the demands of commerce would in time bring Canada into the Union, and increase the Northern preponderance in that Union. (Hear, hear.) I think, Sir, I am justified in regarding the American conflict as one of the warnings we have received; and the third warning, that things cannot go on in this country as they are, is a warning voice from within—a warning voice from our own experience in the government of these Provinces. (Hear, hear.) On these internal constitutional difficulties existing among ourselves, which were so fully exposed last evening by my hon. friend the President of the Council, I need say little; they are admitted to have been real, not imaginary, on all hands. An illustration was used in another place in explaining this part of the subject by the venerable and gallant knight, our Premier, than which nothing could be more clear. He observed that when we had had five administrations within four years, it was full time to look out for some permanent remedy for such a state of things. True—most true—Constitutional Government among us had touched its lowest point when it existed only by the successful search of a messenger or a page after a member

willingly or unwillingly absent from his seat. Any one might in those days have been the saviour of his country. All he had to do was, when one of the five successive governments which arose in four years was in danger, to rise in his place, say "Yea!" and *presto* the country was saved. (Laughter.) This House was fast losing, under such a state of things, its hold on the country; the administrative departments were becoming disorganised under such frequent changes of chiefs and policies; we were nearly as bad as the army of the Potomac before its "permanent remedy" was found in General Grant. Well, we have had our three warnings; one warning from within and two from without. I daresay, Sir, we all remember the old school-book story of the "Three Warnings;" how Death promised not to come after a certain individual he had unintentionally intruded on on his wedding-day. I say unintentionally, for Death is a gentleman, and seldom walks in unannounced (laughter); but he promised not to call upon this particular person without giving him three distinct warnings. Well, the honourable gentleman in question—I daresay he was honourable, and a member of some house—he, like all the rest of us, expected to out-live everybody. But in process of years he fell lame, then afterwards he became deaf, and at last he grew blind: then Death's hour had come, and in spite of some admirable pleading on behalf of the defendant in the case, he had his "three warnings" like a Parisian editor, his case was closed, his form was locked up, and his impression was struck off the face of the earth, and Death claimed and had his own. (Laughter.) Now, Sir, we have had three warnings, and if we do not take heed of them and prepare for the possible future condition into which we may be plunged, wo to us if we are found unprepared when the hour of destiny strikes! (Cheers.) We have submitted a plan preparing us for such a contingency, and the Attorneys-General East and West have analysed its constitutional character, while the Minister of Finance and the President of the Council have treated it in its financial aspects. There are some objections to be taken to the plan, I

understand, in detail; but I do not believe that any member will get up in this House and declare that he is an anti-unionist, and that he is opposed to union, and that he considers union unnecessary and inexpedient. (Hear, hear.) I do not know that there is one man out of the one hundred and thirty who compose this House, in view of the circumstances in which we are placed, who will declare that he is opposed to every sort of union with the Lower Provinces. One may say that he does not like this or the other clause—that he does not like this or that feature of the proposed scheme; but still all admit that union of some kind would increase our protection and be a source of strength. Some honourable gentlemen, while admitting that we have entered, within the present decade, on a period of political transition, have contended that we might have bridged the abyss with that Prussian pontoon called a Zollverein. But if any one for a moment will remember that the trade of the whole front of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia gravitates at present along-shore to Portland and Boston, while the trade of Upper Canada, west of Kingston, has long gravitated across the lakes to New York, he will see, I think, that a mere Zollverein treaty without a strong political end to serve, and some political power at its back, would be, in our new circumstances, merely waste paper. (Hear, hear.) The charge that we have not gone far enough—that we have not struck out boldly for a consolidated union, instead of a union with reserved local jurisdictions—is another charge which deserves some notice. To this I answer that if we had had, as was proposed, an Intercolonial Railway twenty years ago, we might by this time have been perhaps, and only perhaps, in a condition to unite into one consolidated government; but certain politicians and capitalists having defeated that project twenty years ago, special interests took the place great general interest might by this time have occupied; vested rights and local ambitions arose and were recognised; and all these had to be admitted as existing in a pretty advanced stage of development when the late conferences were called together. (Hear, hear.) The lesson to be learned from this squan-

dering of quarter centuries by British Americans is this, that if we lose the present propitious opportunity, we may find it as hard a few years hence to get an audience, even for any kind of union (except democratic union), as we should have found it to get a hearing last year for a legislative union, from the long period of estrangement and non-intercourse which had existed between these Provinces, and the special interests which had grown up in the meantime in each of them. (Cheers.) Another motive to union, or rather a phase of the last motive spoken of, is this, that the policy of our neighbours to the south of us has always been aggressive. There has always been a desire amongst them for the acquisition of new territory, and the inexorable law of democratic existence seems to be its absorption. They coveted Florida, and seized it; they coveted Louisiana, and purchased it; they coveted Texas, and stole it; and then they picked a quarrel with Mexico, which ended by their getting California. (Hear, hear.) They sometimes pretend to despise these colonies as prizes beneath their ambition; but had we not had the strong arm of England over us we should not now have had a separate existence. (Cheers.) The acquisition of Canada was the first ambition of the American Confederacy, and never ceased to be so, when her troops were a handful and her navy scarce a squadron. Is it likely to be stopped now, when she counts her guns aloft by thousands and her troops by hundreds of thousands? On this motive a very powerful expression of opinion has lately appeared in a published letter of the Archbishop of Halifax, Dr. Connolly. Who is the Archbishop of Halifax? In either of the coast colonies, where he has laboured in his high vocation for nearly a third of a century, it would be absurd to ask the question; but in Canada he may not be equally well known. Some of my honourable friends in this and the other House, who were his guests last year, must have felt the impress of his character as well as the warmth of his hospitality. (Hear, hear.) Well, he is known as one of the first men in sagacity as he is in position, in any of these colonies; that he was for many years the intimate associate of his late

distinguished *confrère*, Archbishop Hughes of New York ; that he knows the United States as thoroughly as he does the Provinces, and these are his views on this particular point ; the extract is somewhat long, but so excellently put that I am sure the House will be obliged to me for the whole of it :—

“ Instead of cursing, like the boy in the upturned boat, and holding on until we are fairly on the brink of the cataract, we must at once begin to pray and strike out for the shore by all means, before we get too far down on the current. We must at this most critical moment invoke the Arbiter of nations for wisdom, and abandoning in time our perilous position, we must strike out boldly, and at some risk, for some rock on the nearest shore—some resting-place of greater security. A cavalry raid or a visit from our Fenian friends on horseback, through the plains of Canada and the fertile valleys of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, may cost more in a single week than Confederation for the next fifty years ; and if we are to believe you, where is the security even at the present moment against such a disaster ? Without the whole power of the mother country by land and sea, and the concentration in a single hand of all the strength of British America, our condition is seen at a glance. Whenever the present difficulties will terminate—and who can tell the moment ?—we will be at the mercy of our neighbours ; and victorious or otherwise, they will be eminently a military people, and with all their apparent indifference about annexing this country, and all the friendly feelings that may be talked, they will have the power to strike when they please, and this is precisely the kernel and the only touch-point of the whole question. No nation ever had the power of conquest that did not use it, or abuse it, at the very first favourable opportunity. All that is said of the magnanimity and forbearance of mighty nations can be explained on the principle of sheer inexpediency, as the world knows. The whole face of Europe has been changed, and the dynasties of many hundred years have been swept away within our own time, on the principle of might alone—the

oldest, the strongest, and as some would have it, the most sacred of all titles. The thirteen original States of America, with all their professions of self-denial, have been all the time, by money, power, and by war, and by negotiation, extending their frontier until they more than quadrupled their territory within sixty years; and believe it who may, are they now of their own accord to come to a full stop? No; as long as they have the power, they must go on onward: for it is the very nature of power to grip whatever is within its reach. It is not their hostile feelings, therefore, but it is their power, and only their power, I dread; and I now state it as my solemn conviction, that it becomes the duty of every British subject in these Provinces to control that power, not by the insane policy of attacking or weakening them, but by strengthening ourselves—rising, with the whole power of Britain at our back, to their level, and so be prepared for any emergency. There is no sensible or unprejudiced man in the community who does not see that vigorous and timely preparation is the only possible means of saving us from the horrors of a war such as the world has never seen. To be fully prepared is the only practical argument that can have weight with a powerful enemy, and make him pause beforehand and count the cost. And as the sort of preparation I speak of is utterly hopeless without the union of the Provinces, so at a moment when public opinion is being formed on this vital point, as one deeply concerned, I feel it a duty to declare myself unequivocally in favour of Confederation as cheaply and as honourably as possible—but Confederation at all hazards and at all reasonable sacrifices.

“After the most mature consideration, and all the arguments I have heard on both sides for the last month, these are my inmost convictions on the necessity and merits of a measure which alone, under Providence, can secure to us social order and peace, and rational liberty, and all the blessings we now enjoy under the mildest Government and the hallowed institutions of the freest and happiest country in the world.” (Cheers.)

These are the words of a statesman—of a mitred states-

man—one of that order of mighty men, powerful in their generation, whose statesmanly gifts have been cast in the strong mould of theological discipline—such men as were Ximenes and Wolsey, Laud and Knox. No one more deprecates than I do the interference of clergymen in mere party politics, and I think such is the sentiment also of His Grace of Halifax; but when it is an issue of peace or war, of deliverance or conquest, who has a better, who so good a right to speak as the ministers of the Gospel of peace, and justice, and true freedom? Observe once more these two closing sentences, "I feel it a duty," says the illustrious Archbishop, "to declare myself unequivocally in favour of Confederation as cheaply and as honourably obtained as possible, but Confederation at all hazards and at all reasonable sacrifices. After the most mature consideration, and all the arguments I have heard on both sides for the last month, these are my inmost convictions on the necessity and merits of a measure which alone, under Providence, can secure to us social order and peace, and rational liberty, and all the blessings we now enjoy under the mildest Government and the hallowed institutions of the freest and happiest country in the world." (Hear, hear.) The next motive for union to which I shall refer is, that it will strengthen rather than weaken the connection with the Empire, so essential to these rising Provinces. Those who may be called, if there are any such, the anti-unionists, allege, that this scheme now submitted will bring separation in its train. How, pray? By making these countries more important, will you make them less desirable as connections to England? By making their trade more valuable, will you make her more anxious to get rid of it? By reducing their Federal tariff, will you lessen their interest for England? By making them stronger for each other's aid, will you make her less willing to discharge a lighter than a greater responsibility? But if the thing did not answer itself, England has answered that she "cordially approves" of our plan of union,—and she has always been accounted a pretty good judge of her own Imperial interests. (Hear, hear.) She does not con-



sider our union inimical to those interests. Instead of looking upon it with a dark and discouraging frown, she cheers us on by her most cordial approval and bids us a hearty "God speed" in the new path we have chosen to enter. (Hear, hear.) But I put it on provincial grounds as well. We are not able to go alone, and if we attempted it we would almost certainly go to our own destruction—so that as we cannot go alone, and as we do not desire union with the United States, it is the duty of every man to do all in his power to strengthen the connection with Great Britain? And how shall we do it? Is it by compelling the Imperial Government to negotiate at Charlottetown, for every man and musket required for our defence, to negotiate again at Halifax, and again at Frederickton, and again at St. John's, and again at Quebec? Is it by having these five separate governments that we are to render the connection desirable? or is it by putting the power of these colonies into the hands of one General Government and making the negotiations between two parties only, thereby simplifying the whole transaction and expediting whatever is to be done between the two countries? (Hear, hear.) I will content myself, Mr. Speaker, with those principal motives to union; first, that we are in the rapids, and must go on; next, that our neighbours will not, on their side, let us rest supinely, even if we could do so from other causes; and thirdly, that by making the united colonies more valuable as an ally to Great Britain, we shall strengthen rather than weaken the Imperial connection. (Cheers.) Let me now, Sir, call your attention to the difficulties, past and present, which this great project had to encounter, before it reached the fortunate stage in which we now find it; by considering these difficulties we shall be the better enabled to see the folly of throwing the subject back into the cauldron, merely on the ground of detail. When a Union was advocated by individuals, however eminent, of course it had but scanty chance of success. (Hear, hear.) That was the first stage; when, as in 1822 and 1839, it found favour with Downing Street, it excited the suspicions of the

colonists; when it was identified with the Quebec and Halifax railway project, it shared the same fate,—it was sacrificed to the jealousies and dissensions which destroyed that particular undertaking. When, as in the case of my hon. friend (Mr. Galt's) motion, and my own motion in 1860, the subject was mooted in this House by a private member, the Ministry of the day could not allow so grave a measure to succeed in other hands than their own; when, as was the case in 1858, the Ministry committed themselves to it, the Opposition complained that Parliament had not been consulted. When Canada proposed to move, in 1859, Newfoundland alone responded; when Nova Scotia moved, in 1860, New Brunswick alone agreed to go with her; at all events, Canada did not then concur. (Hear, hear.) Of late years the language of the Colonial Office, of Mr. Labouchere, of Sir Bulwer Lytton, and of the lamented Duke of Newcastle, was substantially, "Agree among yourselves, gentlemen, and we will not stand in the way." Ah! there was the rub—"Agree among yourselves!" Easier said than done, with five colonies so long estranged, and whose former negotiations had generally ended in bitter controversies. Up to the last year there was no conjunction of circumstances favourable to bringing about this union, and probably if we suffer this opportunity to be wasted we shall never see again such another conjunction as will enable us to agree, even so far, among ourselves. By a most fortunate concurrence of circumstances—by what I presume to call, speaking of events of this magnitude, a Providential concurrence of circumstances—the Government of Canada was so modified last spring as to enable it to deal fearlessly with this subject, at the very moment when the coast colonies, despairing of a Canadian union, were arranging a conference of their own for a union of their own. Our Government embraced among its members from the western section the leaders of the former Ministry and former Opposition from that section. At the time it was formed it announced to this House that it was its intention as part of its policy to seek a conference with the Lower Colonies, and endeavour to bring about a general

union. This House formally gave the Government its confidence after the announcement of that policy, and although I have no desire to strain terms, it does appear to me that this House did thereby fully commit itself to the principle of a union of the colonies, if practicable. That is my view, Sir, of the relations of this House to the Government after it gave it expressly its confidence. Other members of the House take another view of that matter, they do not think themselves committed even to the principle, and they certainly are not to the details of the scheme. (Hear.) After the coalition was formed an incident occurred, which, though not of national importance, it would be most ungrateful of me to forget. An Intercolonial Excursion was proposed and was rendered practicable through the public spirit of two gentlemen representing our great railway, of which so many hard things have been said that I feel it my duty to say this good thing. I refer to the Honourable Mr. Ferrier and Mr. Brydges. (Cheers.) Forty members of this House, twenty-five members of the other House, and forty gentlemen of the press and other professions, from Canada, joined in that excursion. So many Canadians had never seen so much of the Lower Provinces before, and the people of the Lower Provinces had never seen so many Canadians. Our reception was beyond all description kind and cordial. The general sentiment of union was everywhere cheered to the echo, though I am sorry to find that some of those who cheered then, when it was but a general sentiment, seem to act very differently now that it has become a ripened project, and I fear that they do not intend to act up to the words they then uttered. They may, perhaps, intend to do so, but they have a very odd way of going about it. (Laughter.) Well, Sir, this was in August; the Charlotte-town Conference was called in September, the Quebec Conference in October, and the tour of the maritime delegates through Canada took place in November. Four months of the eight which have elapsed since we promised this House to deal with it have been almost wholly given up to this great enterprise. Let me bear my

tribute, Mr. Speaker, now that I refer to the conference, to the gentlemen from the Lower Provinces, who sat so many days in council with us, under this roof. (Cheers.) A very worthy citizen of Montreal, when I went up a day or two in advance of the Montreal banquet, asked me, with a curious sort of emphasis—"What sort of people are they?"—meaning the maritime delegates. I answered him then, as I repeat now, that they were, as a body, as able and accomplished a body, I thought, as any new country could produce,—and that some among them would compare not unfavourably in ability and information with some of the leading commoners of England. As our Government included a representation both of the former Opposition and the former Ministry, so their delegations were composed in about equal parts of the Opposition and Ministerial parties of their several provinces. A more hard-working set of men; men more tenacious of their own rights, yet more considerate for those of others; men of readier resource in debate; men of gentler manners; men more willing to bear and forbear, I hardly can hope to see together at one council table again. (Cheers.) But why need I dwell on this point? They were seen and heard in all our principal cities, and I am sure every Canadian who met them here was proud of them as fellow-subjects, and would be happy to feel that he could soon call them fellow-countrymen in fact as well as in name. (Cheers.) Sir, by this combination of great abilities—by this coalition of leaders who never before acted together—through this extraordinary armistice in party warfare, obtained in every colony at the same moment—after all this labour and all this self-sacrifice—after all former impediments had been most fortunately overcome—the treaty was concluded and signed by us all—and there it lies for your ratification. The propositions contained in it have been objected to, and we were reminded the other evening by the honourable member for Chateauguy, that we are not a treaty-making power. Well, in reference to that objection, I believe the Imperial Government has in certain cases, such as the Reciprocity Treaty, conceded to these Provinces the

right of coercion; and in this case there is the Imperial despatch of 1862 to Lord Mulgrave, Governor of Nova Scotia, distinctly authorising the public men of the colonies to confer with each other on the subject of union, and inviting them to submit the result of their conferences to the Imperial Government. (Hear, hear.) We assembled under the authority and acted under the sanction of that despatch. Everything we did was done in form and with propriety, and the result of our proceedings is the document that has been submitted to the Imperial Government as well as to this House, and which we speak of here as a treaty. And that there may be no doubt about our position in regard to that document we say, Question it you may, reject it you may, or accept it you may, but alter it you may not. (Hear, hear.) It is beyond your power, or our power, to alter it. There is not a sentence—not even a word—you can alter without desiring to throw out the document. Alter it, and we know at once what you mean—you thereby declare yourselves against the only possible union. (Hear, hear.) On this point, I repeat after all my hon. friends who have already spoken, for one party to alter a treaty, is, of course, to destroy it. Let us be frank with each other; you do not like our work, nor do you like us who stand by it, clause by clause, line by line, and letter by letter. Oh! but this clause ought to run thus, and this other clause thus. Does any hon. member seriously think that any treaty in the world between five separate provinces ever gave full and entire satisfaction on every point, to every party? Does any hon. member seriously expect to have a constitutional act framed to his order, or my order, or any man's order? No, Sir, I am sure no legislator, at least since Anacharsis Clootz was Attorney-General of the Human Race, ever expected such ideal perfection. (Laughter.) It may be said by some hon. gentlemen that they admit the principle of this measure to be good, but that it should be dealt with as an ordinary parliamentary subject in the usual parliamentary manner. Mr. Speaker, this is not an ordinary parliamentary measure. *We* do not legislate upon it, *we* do not enact it,—that is for a

higher authority. Suppose the Address adopted by this House to-morrow,—is the act of this House final and conclusive? No. It is for the Imperial Parliament to act upon it. (Hear, hear.) That body that can cause the several propositions to be moulded into a measure which will have the form of law, and these resolutions ~~may~~ <sup>are</sup> probably be the *ipsisissima verba* of the measure they will give us and the other Provinces. But some hon. gentlemen opposite say, that if there be defects in this treaty they ought to be remedied now, and that the Government ought to be glad to have them pointed out. Yes, surely, if this were simply the act of the Parliament of Canada; but it is not to be our act alone. It is an Address to the Throne, in the terms to which four other colonies are parties, and even if we were to make alterations in it, we cannot bind them to accept them. If we were weak and wicked enough to alter a solemn agreement with the other Provinces, the moment their representatives had turned their backs and gone home, what purpose would it serve except that of defeating the whole measure, and throwing it as well as the country back again into chaos? (Hear, hear.) I admit, Sir, as we have been told, that we ought to aim at perfection; but who has ever attained it, except perhaps the hon. member for Broome? (Laughter.) We, however, did strive and aim at the mark, and we think we made a tolerably good shot. The hon. member for Chateauguay will not be satisfied—insatiate archer!—unless we hit the bull's eye. (Laughter.) My hon. friend is well read in political literature—will he mention me one authority, from the first to the last, who ever held that human government was or could be anything more than what a modern sage called “an approximation to the right,” and an ancient called “the possible best?” Well, we believe we have here given to our countrymen of all the Provinces the possible best—that we have given them an approximation to the right—their representatives and ours have laboured at it, letter and spirit, form and substance, until they found this basis of agreement, which we are all confident will not now, nor for many a day to come, be

easily swept away. Before I pass to another point, Sir, permit me to pay my tribute of unfeigned respect to one of our Canadian colleagues in this work, who is no longer with us; I mean the present Vice-Chancellor of Upper Canada (Hon. Mr. Mowat), who took a constant and honourable share in the preparation of this project. (Cheers.) Now, Sir, I wish to say a few words in reference to what I call the social relations which I think ought to exist and are likely to spring up between the people of the Lower Provinces and ourselves if there is a closer communication established between us, and also in reference to the social fitness to each of the parties to this proposed union. And first, I will make a remark to some of the French Canadian gentlemen who are said to be opposed to our project, on French Canadian grounds only. I will remind them, I hope not improperly, that every one of the colonies we now propose to re-unite under one rule—in which they shall have a potential voice—were once before united as New France. (Cheers.) Newfoundland, the uttermost, was theirs, and one large section of its coast is still known as “the French shore;” Cape Breton was theirs till the final fall of Louisburgh; Prince Edward Island was their Island of St. Jean; Charlottetown was their Port Joli; and Frederickton, the present capital of New Brunswick, their St. Anne’s; in the heart of Nova Scotia was that fair Arcadian land, where the roll of Longfellow’s noble hexameters may be heard in every wave that breaks upon the base of Cape Blomedon. (Cheers.) In the northern counties of New Brunswick, from the Miramichi to the Matapédia, they had their forts and farms, their churches and their festivals, before the English speech had ever once been heard between those rivers. Nor is that tenacious Norman and Breton race extinct in their old haunts and homes. I have heard one of the members for Cape Breton speak in high terms of that portion of his constituency, and I believe I am correct in saying that Mr. Le Visconte, the late Finance Minister of Nova Scotia, was, in the literal sense of the term, an Arcadian. Mr. Cozzans, of New York, who wrote a very readable little book the other day

about Nova Scotia, describes the French residents near the basin of Minas, and he says, especially of the women, "they might have stepped out of Normandy a hundred years ago!" In New Brunswick there is more than one county, especially in the North, where business, and law, and politics, require a knowledge of both French and English. A worthy friend of ours, Hon. Mr. Mitchell of Chatham, who was present at the earlier meetings of the Conference, owed his first election for one of these counties, because he was *Pierre Michel*, and could speak to his French constituents in their own language. I will, with leave of the House, read on this interesting subject a passage from a very capital sketch of the French district of New Brunswick in 1863, by Lieutenant Governor Gordon [it is in Galston's "Vacation Tourist for 1864," and is exceedingly interesting throughout]; Mr. Gordon says:—

"The French population, which forms so large a proportion among the inhabitants of the counties of Westmoreland; Kent, and Gloucester, appears to me as contented as the *habitants* of Victoria, but hardly equally as well off. There was an air of comfort and *bien-être* about the large timber two-storied houses, painted a dark Indian red, standing among the trees, the numerous good horses, the well-tilled fields and sleek cattle, which is wanting on the sea coast. We stopped after a pleasant drive, affording us good views of the beautiful peak of Green River Mountain, at the house of a Monsieur Violet, at the mouth of Grand River, which was to be our starting point. The whole aspect of the farm was that of the *métairie* in Normandy—the outer doors of the house gaudily painted—the panels of a different colour from the frame—the large, open, uncarpeted room, with its bare shining floor—the lasses at the spinning-wheel—the French costume and appearance of Madame Violet and her sons and daughters, all carried me back to the other side of the Atlantic. After a short conversation with the Violets, we walked down to the bridge, where two log-canoes, manned by Frenchmen—three *Cyrs* and a *Thibaudeau*—were waiting for us, and pushed off from the shore."



It will be observed Governor Gordon speaks of four counties in the north of New Brunswick which still bear a marked French character. Well, gentlemen of French origin, we propose to restore these long-lost compatriots to your protection: in the Federal Union, which will recognise equally both languages, they will naturally look to you; their petitions will come to you, and their representatives will naturally be found allied with you. Suppose those four New Brunswick counties are influenced by the French vote, and say two in Nova Scotia, you will, should you need them, have them as sure allies to your own compact body, to aid your legitimate influence in the Federal Councils. (Cheers.) I proceed with my analysis of the maritime population, in order to establish the congruity and congeniality of our proposed union. In point of time, the next oldest element in that population is the Irish settlement of Ferryland, in Newfoundland, undertaken by Lord Baltimore and Lord Falkland (Lord Lieutenant of Ireland at the time), immediately after the restoration of King Charles II., soon after 1660. Newfoundland still remains strongly Irish, as is natural, since it is the next parish to Ireland—(laughter)—and I think we saw a very excellent specimen of its Irish natives at our Conference in Ambrose Shea. (Cries of "hear, hear.") To me, I confess, it is particularly grateful to reflect that the only Irish colony, as it may be called, of our group, is to be included in the new arrangements. (Hear.) Another main element in the Lower Province population is the Highland Scotch. Large tracts of Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton were granted after the Peace of Paris, to officers and men of Frazer's Highlanders and other Scottish regiments, which had distinguished themselves during the Seven Years' war. If my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. D. A. Macdonald) had been with us last September at Charlottetown, he would have met clansmen, whom he would have been proud to know, and who could have conversed with him in his own cherished Gaelic.

MR. D. A. MACDONALD.—They are all over the world. (Laughter.)

Hon. Mr. McGEE.—So much the better for the world. (Cheers.) And I will tell him what I think is to their honour, that the Highlanders in all the Lower Provinces preserve faithfully the religion, as well as the language and traditions, of their fathers. The Catholic Bishop of Charlottetown is a McIntyre; his Right Rev. brother of Arichat (Cape Breton) is a McKinnon; and in the list of the clergy, I find a constant succession of such names as McDonald, McGillis, McGillvary, McLeod, McKenzie, and Cameron—all “Anglo-Saxons” of course, and mixed up with them Fourniers, Gauvreaux, Paquets, and Martells, whose origin is easy to discover. (Cheers.) Another of the original elements of that population remains to be noticed—the U. E. Loyalists, who founded New Brunswick (as they founded Upper Canada), for whom New Brunswick was made a separate Province in 1784, as Upper Canada was for their relatives in 1791. Their descendants still flourish in the land, holding many positions of honour, and as a representative of the class, I shall only mention Judge Wilmot, who the other day declared in charging one of his grand juries, that if it were necessary to carry Confederation in New Brunswick, so impressed was he with the necessity of the measure to the very existence of British laws and British institutions on this continent, he was prepared to quit the bench and return to politics. (Cheers.) There are other elements also not to be overlooked. The thrifty Germans of Lunenburg, whose homes are the neatest upon the land, as their fleet is the tightest on the sea; and other smaller subdivisions; but I shall not prolong this analysis. I may observe, however, that this population is almost universally a native population of three or four or more generations. In New Brunswick, at the most there is about twelve per cent. of an immigrant people; in Nova Scotia, about eight; in the two Islands, even less. In the eye of the law, we admit no disparity between natives and immigrants in this country; but it is to be considered that where men are born in the presence of the graves of their fathers, for even a few generations, the influence of the fact is great in

enhancing their attachment to that soil. I admit, for my part, as an immigrant, of no divided allegiance to Canada and her interests; but it would be untrue and paltry to deny a divided affection between the old country and the new. Kept within just bounds, such an affection is reasonable, is right and creditable to those who cherish it. (Hear, hear.) Why I refer to this broad fact which distinguishes the populations of all the four seaward Provinces as much as it does Lower Canada herself, is, to show the fixity and stability of that population; to show that they are by birth British-Americans; that they can nearly all, of every origin, use that proud phrase when they look daily from their doors, "this is my own, my native land." (Cheers.) Let but that population and ours come together for a generation or two—such are the elements that compose, such the conditions that surround it—and their mutual descendants will hear with wonder, when the history of these present transactions is written, that this plan of union could ever have been seriously opposed by statesmen in Canada or elsewhere. (Cheers.) I am told, however, by one or two members of this House, and by exclusive-minded Canadians out of it, that they cannot get up any patriotic feeling about this union with New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, and that they cannot look with any interest at those colonies, with which we have had hitherto so little association. "What's Heecuba to me, or I to Heecuba?" Well, I answer to that, know them, and my word for it, you will like them. I have made several journeys there, and I have seen much of the people, and the more I have seen of them, the more I respected and esteemed them. (Hear, hear.) I say, then, to these gentlemen, that if you desire any patriotism on the subject; if you want to stir up a common sentiment of affection between these people and ourselves, bring us all into closer relation together, and having the elements of a vigorous nationality within us, each will find something to like and respect in the other; mutual confidence and respect will follow, and the feeling of being engaged in a common cause for the good of a common nationality will grow up of itself without being forced

by any man's advocacy. (Hear, hear.) The thing who shuts up his heart against his kindred, his neighbours, and his fellow-subjects, may be a very pretty fellow at a parish vestry, but do you call such a forked-radish as that, a man? (Laughter.) Don't so abuse the noblest word in the language. (Hear, hear.) Sir, there is one other argument for this union, or rather an illustration of its mutually advantageous character, which I draw from the physical geography and physical resources of the whole territory which it is proposed to unite; but before I draw the attention of the House to it, I may perhaps refer to a charge that probably will be made against me, that I am making what may appear to be a non-political speech. If it be non-political in the sense of non-partisan, then I plead guilty to the charge; but I think that on some of the points to which I have alluded the country is desirous of being informed, and as many hon. gentlemen have not had time to make a tour of the country to the east of us, those who have had the opportunity of doing so cannot, I think, better subserve the interest of the community than by giving what appears to them a fair, just, and truthful sketch of those Provinces and their people, and thus informing those in Canada who have not had the opportunity of making observations for themselves on the spot. (Hear, hear.) It was remarked by the late Sir John Beverley Robinson, in his letter to Lord John Russell in 1839, that if the British Government had attempted to maintain the ancient boundaries of New France, in the treaty which acknowledged the United States, it would have been an unfortunate attempt, and impossible after all. Those boundaries extended to the Ohio on the south, and included much of what is now called by our neighbours "the North-West." There is great force, I think, in this observation. But in relation to what I may call the ground-plan on which we propose to erect our constitutional edifice, its natural oneness is admirable to contemplate. There is not one port or harbour of all the Provinces now proposing to confederate, which cannot be reached from any other by all vessels, if not of too great draught, without ever once leaving our

own waters. From the head of Lake Superior the same craft may coast uninterruptedly, always within sight of our own shores, nearly the distance of a voyage to England—to St. John's, Newfoundland. (Cheers.) We sometimes complain of our inland navigation, that we have it free but half the year round, but what it lacks at one season it amply compensates by its vast capacity. (Cheers.) Last summer, when we visited Halifax in the "Queen Victoria," which the good people of that blockade-running stronghold mistook for a Confederate cruiser, we were the better part of a week steaming away, always in British American waters, within sight of the bold and beautiful coasts which it was our privilege to call our own. (Cheers.) While we were thus following our river system to the open sea, I could not help often recurring to the vast extent of the whole. If any hon. gentleman who has never made, or who cannot find time to make, a journey through his own country, will only go to the library, he will find an excellent substitute for such a voyage in Keith Johnston's "Physical Atlas," a book that when one opens it leaves his brain opens with the book. (Laughter.) He will find that our matchless St. Lawrence drains an area of 298,000 square miles, of which only 94,000 are occupied by the five great lakes taken together. Of the commerce already afloat upon those waters, and the commerce of which they are capable of being the vehicle, it is hardly necessary, after what has been already said, for me to speak. I shall not attempt to tread in the path of my two friends who sit next me (Hon. Messrs. Galt and Brown) by exhibiting in any detail the prospects of mutual commercial advantages opened up by this union; but I have prepared a statement of my own on this subject, giving certain general results,—which I do not present as complete, but only as approximately correct—and which I now beg to read to the House:—

Territory.	POPULATION.				REPRESENTATION.	
	No. of Square Miles.	No. of Acres under Cultivation, 1963	No. of Persons per Head, 1961	Com- parative Number.	No. of Members proposed by each Member	No. of Persons represented
Canada, Upper*	120,269	28,91	6,651,619	42.98	11.01	17,025
"    Lower	210,629	52.45	4,804,225	33.75	5.29	17,101
Nova Scotia	18,671	4.45	1,111,522	10.04	17.72	17,413
New Brunswick	27,105	6.46	1,067,752	7.65	9.29	16,823
Prince Edward Island	2,173	0.51	82,618	2.45	37.20	13,229
Newfoundland	40,290	9.53	122,635	3.73	3.65	16,171
Totals	419,429	100.00	13,045,754	100.00	7.55	16,579

Province.	REVENUE.				EXPENDITURE.			EXCESS.
	1963. Amount.	Compa- rative.	Amount per Head.	1963. Amount.	Compa- rative.	Amount per Head.		
Canada	\$67,293,994	50.14	\$3.82	\$10,742,807	80.46	\$4.38	\$313,355	
Nova Scotia	4,585,537	6.14	14.65	1,072,274	2.94	3.24	12,378	
New Brunswick	5,702,991	7.21	22.63	884,613	6.62	3.50	25,666	
Prince Edward Island	244,673	0.31	2.97	121,714	1.29	2.12	590	
Newfoundland (1962)	945,000	1.20	7.71	479,420	3.59	3.90	590	
Totals	\$79,012,295	100.00	\$23.98	\$12,350,322	100.00	\$4.05	\$98,491	

Province.	IMPORTS.			EXPORTS.			Average Tariffs.
	1963. Amount.	Compara- tive.	Amount per Head.	1963. Amount.	Compara- tive.	Amount per Head.	
Canada	\$45,904,000	65.10	\$15.12	\$41,841,000	62.58	\$16.68	20 % cent.
Nova Scotia	10,210,391	14.46	30.36	2,427,668	12.58	25.45	10 % cent.
New Brunswick	7,764,524	11.00	30.90	8,984,754	13.44	36.56	15 % cent.
Prince Edward Island	1,288,028	2.62	17.66	1,627,540	2.43	20.12	11 % cent.
Newfoundland	5,242,720	7.42	42.75	6,002,212	8.97	45.96	10 % cent.
Totals	\$70,600,593	100.00	\$21.43	\$66,846,604	100.00	\$29.29	13.3 % cent.

\* Canada — The extent in square miles refers to known or surveyed land, as the Northern and Western limit of Canada has never been absolutely laid down.

† All the calculations respecting population made upon the census of 1861.

But there is, in addition to all that I have quoted, one special source of wealth to be found in the Maritime Provinces, which was not in any detail exhibited by my hon. friends—I allude to the important article of coal. I think there can be no doubt that, in some parts of Canada, we are fast passing out of the era of wood as fuel, and entering on that of coal. In my own city every year, there is great suffering among the poor from the enormous price of fuel, and large sums are paid away by national societies and benevolent individuals, to prevent whole families perishing for want of fuel. I believe we must all cope with Sir William Logan, that we have no coal in Canada, and I may venture to state, on my own authority, another fact, that we have—a five months' winter, generally very cold. Now, what are the coal resources of our maritime friends, to whose mines Confederation would give us free and untaxed access for ever? I take these data from the authority in my hand—from the highest authority on the subject—Taylor's "Coal Fields of the New World:"—

"Dr. A. Gesner, in a communication to the Geological Society of London, 1843, states that the area of the coal fields of New Brunswick has been recently determined to be 7,500 square miles; and 10,000 square miles, including Nova Scotia, but exclusive of Cape Breton. Since his first report he has explored the whole of this vast region, and has found the area covered by that coal formation to be no less than 8,000 square miles in New Brunswick. He says the most productive coal beds prevail in the interior; while those of Nova Scotia occur on the shores of her bays and river, where they offer every advantage for mining operations. The coal fields of the two provinces are united at the boundary line, and belong to the carboniferous period. The developments of almost every season illustrate more clearly the magnitude of these coal fields; which extend from Newfoundland by Cape Breton, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, and across a large portion of New Brunswick into the State of Maine. Mr. Henwood, a geologist of high standing, observes that the beauty and extent of these coal treasures it is impossible to describe. In Nova Scotia,

Dr. Gesner's statements exhibit an area of coal formation of 2,500 square miles, while Messrs. Logan, Dawson, and Brown greatly exceed even that area. Sir W. E. Logan demonstrated by a laborious survey the thickness or depth of the whole group in Northern Nova Scotia to be over 23 miles, an amount which far exceeds anything seen in the coal formation in other parts of North America; in this group there are seventy-six coal beds one above the other."

I must say, Sir, that this is a cheering statement of facts, coming to us on the very highest authority, and I feel warming with the subject, even while making the statement. (Laughter.) These exhaustless coal fields will, under our plan—which is in fact our Reciprocity Treaty with the Lower Provinces—become, hereafter, the great resource of our towns for fuel. I see the cry is raised below by the anti-unionists, that to proceed with Confederation would be to entail the loss of the New England market for their coals. I do not quite see how they make this out, but even an anti-unionist might see that the population of Canada is within a fraction of that of all New England put together, that we consume in this country as much fuel per annum as they do in New England; and, therefore, that we offer them a market under the union equal to that which these theorizers want to persuade their followers they would lose. (Hear, hear.) Sir, another cry raised by the anti-unionists below is, that they would have to fight for the defence of Canada—a very specious argument. What, Sir, three millions and one million unite, and the one million do the fighting for all! In proportion to their numbers no doubt these valiant gentlemen will have to fight, if fighting is to be done, but not one man or one shilling more than Canada, *pro rata*, will they have to risk or spend. On the contrary, the greater community, if she should not happen to be first attacked, would be obliged to fight for them, and in doing so, I do not hesitate to say, on far better authority than my own, that the man who fights for the valley and harbour of St. John, or even for Halifax, fights for Canada. I will suppose another not impossible case. I will suppose a hostile American army,



on a fishery or any other war, finding it easier and cheaper to seize the lower colonies by land than by sea, by a march from a convenient rendezvous on Lake Champlain, through Lower Canada, into the upper part of New Brunswick, and so downward to the sea—a march like Sherman's march from Knoxville to Savannah. While we obstructed such a march by every means in our power, from the Richelieu to Rivière du Loup, whose battles would we be fighting then? Why, the seaports aimed at, for our common subjugation. (Hear, hear.) But the truth is, all these selfish views and arguments are remarkably short-sighted, unworthy of the subject, and unworthy even of those who use them. In a commercial, in a military, in every point of view, we are all, rightly considered, dependent on each other. Newfoundland dominates the Gulf, and none of us can afford to be separated from her. Lord Chatham said he would as soon abandon Plymouth as Newfoundland to a foreign power, and he is thought to have understood how to govern men. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are Siamese twins, held together by that ligature of land between Baie Verte and Cumberland Basin, and the fate of the one must follow the fate of the other. (Hear, hear.) Prince Edward is only a little bit, broken off by the Northumberland Strait from those two bigger brethren, and Upper and Lower Canada are essential to each other's prosperity. Our very physical outline teaches us the lesson of union, and indicates how many mutual advantages we may all derive from the treaty we have made. Mr. Speaker, while we in Canada have no doubt of the ratification of the Intercolonial Treaty, by this House and country, I cannot conceal from myself that our friends in the Lower Provinces are fighting a battle with narrow views and vested interests, which are always most bitter in the smallest communities. There are coasting trade interests and railway interests at work; and there are the strong interests of honest ignorance and dishonest ingenuity.\*<sup>c</sup> What can these men mean, who are no fools?

\* Events have since confirmed this prediction; but I see no reason to despair of all the Maritime Provinces yet coming freely into the proposed confederation, or some similar political union.

Do they, too, fancy they can get a Government made to their own private order? Do they think they can go on on the old system? Do they mean to give up the country to the Americans? Why not hang up at once the sign, "These Provinces for sale—terms cash!—'greenbacks' taken at par value!" I rejoice to see the unionists of the Maritime Provinces so resolved, so high-spirited, and so united—and though their victory will not be won without work, yet I feel assured it will be a victory. If the honest and misguided would but reflect for a moment the risks they run by defeating, or even delaying this measure, I am sure they would, even yet, retract. (Hear, hear.) If we reject it now, is there any human probability that we shall ever see again so propitious a set of circumstances to bring about the same results? How they came about we all know. (Hear, hear.) The strange and fortunate events that have occurred in Canada; the extraordinary concessions made by the leaders of the Governments below—Dr. Tupper, the Nova Scotian Premier, for instance, admitting to his confidence, and bringing with him here as his co-representatives, Hon. Messrs. Archibald and McCully, two of his most determined political opponents—can we ever expect, if we reject this scheme, that the same or similar things will occur again to favour it? Can we expect to see the leader of the Upper Canadian conservative party and the leader of the Upper Canadian liberals sitting side by side again, if this project fails to work out, in a spirit of mutual compromise and concession, the problem of our constitutional difficulties? No, Sir, it is too much to expect. Miracles would cease to be miracles if they were events of every-day occurrence; the very nature of wonders requires that they should be rare; and this is a miraculous and wonderful circumstance; that men at the head of the Governments in five separate Provinces, and men at the head of the parties opposing them, all agreed at the same time to sink party differences for the good of all, and did not shrink, at the risk of having their motives misunderstood, from associating together for the purpose of bringing about this result. (Cheers.) I have asked, Sir,

what risks do we run if we reject this measure? We run the risk of being swallowed up by the spirit of universal democracy that prevails in the United States. Their usual and favourite motto is—

No pent-up Utica contracts our powers,  
But the whole boundless continent is ours.

That is the popular paraphrase of the Monroe doctrine. And the popular voice has favoured—aye, and the greatest statesmen among them have looked upon it as inevitable—an extension of the principles of democracy over this continent. Now, I suppose a universal democracy is no more acceptable to us than a universal monarchy in Europe would have been to our ancestors; yet for three centuries—from Charles V. to Napoleon—our fathers combated to the death against the subjugation of all Europe to a single system or a single master, and heaped up a debt which has since burthened the producing classes of the empire with an enormous load of taxation, which, perhaps, none other except the hardy and ever-growing industry of those little islands could have borne up under. (Hear, hear.) The idea of a universal democracy in America is no more welcome to the minds of thoughtful men among us than was that of a universal monarchy to the minds of the thoughtful men who followed the standard of the third William, or who afterwards, under the great Marlborough, opposed the armies of the particular dynasty that sought to place Europe under a single dominion. (Hear, hear.) But if we are to have a universal democracy on this continent, the Lower Provinces—the smaller fragments—will be “gobbled up” first, and we will come in afterwards by way of dessert. (Laughter.) The proposed Confederation will enable us to bear up shoulder to shoulder; to resist the spread of this universal democracy doctrine; it will make it more desirable to maintain on both sides the connection that binds us to the parent State; it will raise us from the position of mere dependent colonies to a new and more important position; it will give us a new lease of existence under other and more favour-

able conditions; and resistance to this project, which is pregnant with so many advantages to us and to our children, means simply this, ultimate union with the United States. (Cheers.) But these are small matters, wholly unworthy of the attention of the Smiths, and Annands, and Palmers, who have come forward to forbid the banns of British-American Union. Mr. Speaker, before I draw to a close the little remainder of what I have to say—and I am sorry to have detained the House so long—(cries of “No, no”)—I beg to offer a few observations *apropos* of my own position as an English-speaking member for Lower Canada. I venture, in the first place, to observe that there seems to be a good deal of exaggeration on the subject of race, occasionally introduced, both on the one side and the other, in this section of the country. I congratulate my honourable friend the Attorney-General for this section on his freedom from such prejudices in general, though I still think in matters of patronage and the like he always looks first to his own compatriots—(laughter)—for which neither do I blame him. But this theory of race is sometimes carried to an anti-Christian and unphilosophical excess. Whose words are these—“God hath made of one blood all nations that dwell on the face of the earth?” Is not that the true theory of race? For my part, I am not afraid of the French Canadian majority in the future local Government doing injustice, except accidentally; not because I am of the same religion as themselves; for origin and language are barriers stronger to divide men in this world than is religion to unite them. Neither do I believe that my Protestant compatriots need have any such fear. The French Canadians have never been an intolerant people; it is not in their temper, unless they had been persecuted, perhaps, and then it might have been as it has been with other races of all religions. Perhaps, on this subject, the House will allow me to read a very striking illustration of the tolerance of French Canadian character from a book I hold in my hand, the “Digest of the Synod Minutes of the Presbyterian Church of Canada,” by my worthy friend, the Rev. Mr. Kemp, of the Free Church of

Montreal. The passage is on page seven of the Introduction:—

“About the year 1790 the Presbyterians of Montreal of all denominations, both British and American, organised themselves into a Church, and in the following year secured the services of the Rev. John Young. At this time they met in the Récollet Roman Catholic Church, but in the year following they erected the edifice which is now known as St. Gabriel Street Church—the oldest Protestant Church in the Province. In their early Minutes we find them, in acknowledgment of the kindness of the Récollet Fathers, presenting them with ‘One box of candles, 56lbs., at 8*d.*, and one hogshead of Spanish wine at 6*l.* 5*s.*’”

(Laughter.) I beg my hon. friends, who may have different notions of Christian intercourse at this time of day, just to fancy doings of that sort. (Hear, hear.) Here, on the one hand, are the Récollet Fathers giving up one of their own churches to the disciples of John Knox to enable them to worship God after their own manner, and perhaps to have a gird at Popery in the meantime—(laughter)—and here, on the other hand, are the grateful Presbyterians presenting to these same Seminary priests Presbyterian wine and Presbyterian wax tapers in acknowledgment of the use of their church for Presbyterian service. Certainly a more characteristic instance of tolerance on both sides can hardly be found in the history of any other country. I cite this little incident to draw from it this practical moral—that those who are seeking, and, in some particulars, I believe justly seeking, the settlement of Protestant education in Lower Canada on firmer ground than it now occupies, might well afford to leave the two great Seminaries of Montreal and Quebec at peace. No two institutions in Christendom ever more conscientiously fulfilled the ends of their erection; and whoever does not know all, but even a little, of the good services they have rendered to both the people and the Government of Lower Canada, to the civilisation and settlement of this country, has much yet to learn of the history of Canada. (Hear, hear.) To close this topic, I have no doubt whatever, with a good deal of

moderation and a proper degree of firmness, all that the Protestant minority in Lower Canada can require, by way of security to their educational system, will be cheerfully granted to them by this House. I, for one, as a Roman Catholic, will cordially second and support any such amendments, properly framed. I will merely add, in relation to an observation of my friend (Hon. Mr. Brown) last night on the subject of the Catholic Separate Schools of Upper Canada, that I accepted for my own part, as a finality, the amended Act of 1863. I said I would do so if it granted what the petitioners asked, when, I thought, they ought to be satisfied. I will be no party to the re-opening of the question; but I say this, that if there are to be any special guarantees or grants extended to the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, I think the Catholic minority in Upper Canada ought to be placed in precisely the same position—neither better nor worse. (Hear, hear.) At present I shall not add another word on this subject, as I am not aware of the particular nature of the amendments asked for at present, either east or west. (Hear, hear.) All who have spoken on this subject have said a good deal, as was natural, of the interests at stake in the success or failure of this plan of Confederation. I trust the House will permit me to add a few words as to the principle of Confederation considered in itself. In the application of this principle to former constitutions, there certainly always was one fatal defect, the weakness of the central authority. Of all the Federal constitutions I have ever heard or read of, this was the fatal malady: they were short-lived, they died of consumption. (Laughter.) But I am not prepared to say that because the Tuscan League elected its chief magistrate but for two months and lasted a century, that therefore the Federal principle failed. On the contrary, there is something in the frequent, fond recurrence of mankind to this principle, among the freest people, in their best times and in their worst dangers, which leads me to believe, that it has a very deep hold in human nature itself—an excellent basis for a government to have. But, indeed, Sir, the main question is the due distribution of powers in

a Federal Union—a question I dare not touch to-night, but which I may be prepared to say something on before the vote is taken. The principle itself seems to me to be capable of being so adapted as to promote internal peace and external security, and to call into action a genuine, enduring, and heroic patriotism. It is a fruit of this principle that makes the modern Italian look back with sorrow and pride over a dreary waste of seven centuries to the famous field of Legnano; it was this principle kindled the beacons which yet burn on the rocks of Uri; it was this principle that broke the dykes of Holland and overwhelmed the Spanish with the fate of the Egyptian oppressor. It is a principle capable of inspiring a noble ambition and a most salutary emulation. You have sent your young men to guard your frontier. You want a principle to guard your young men, and thus truly defend your frontier. For what do good men who make the best soldiers fight? For a line of scripture or chalk line—for a text or for a pretext? What is a better boundary between nations than a parallel of latitude, or even a natural obstacle?—what really keeps nations intact and apart?—a principle. When I can hear our young men say as proudly, “our Federation,” or “our Country,” or “our Kingdom,” as the young men of other countries do, speaking of their own, then I shall have less apprehension for the result of whatever trials the future may have in store for us. (Cheers.) It has been said that the Federal Constitution of the United States has failed. I, Sir, have never said it. The Attorney-General West told you the other night that he did not consider it a failure; and I remember that in 1861, when in this House I remarked the same thing, the only man who then applauded the statement was the Attorney-General West,—so that it is plain he did not simply adopt the argument for use the other night when advocating a Federal Union among ourselves. (Hear, hear.) It may be a failure for us, paradoxical as this may seem, and yet not a failure for them. They have had eighty years’ use of it, and having discovered its defects, may apply a remedy and go on with it eighty years longer. But we also were

lookers on, who saw its defects as the machine worked, and who have prepared contrivances by which it can be improved and kept in more perfect order when applied to ourselves. And one of the foremost statesmen in England, distinguished alike in politics and literature, has declared, as the President of the Council informed us, that we have combined the best parts of the British and the American systems of government; an opinion deliberately formed at a distance, without prejudice, and expressed without interested motives of any description. (Hear, hear.) We have, in relation to the head of the Government, in relation to the judiciary, in relation to the second chamber of the Legislature, in relation to the financial responsibility of the General Government, and in relation to the public officials whose tenure of office is during good behaviour instead of at the caprice of a party—in all these respects we have adopted the British system; in other respects we have learned something from the American system, and I trust and believe we have made a very tolerable combination of both. (Hear, hear.) The principle of Federation is a generous principle. It is a principle that gives men local duties to discharge, and invests them at the same time with general supervision, that excites a healthy sense of responsibility and comprehension. It is a principle that has produced a wise and true spirit of statesmanship in all countries in which it has ever been applied. It is a principle eminently favourable to liberty, because local affairs are left to be dealt with by local bodies, and cannot be interfered with by those who have no local interest in them, while matters of a general character are left exclusively to a General Government. It is a principle inseparable from every government that ever gave extended and important services to a country, because all governments have been more or less confederations in their character. Spain was a Federation, for although it had a king reigning over the whole country, it had its local governments for the administration of local affairs. The British Isles are a *quasi* Confederation, and the old French dukedoms were confederated in the States-General. It is a

x



principle that runs through all the history of civilisation in one form or another, and exists alike in monarchies and democracies ; and having adopted it as the principle of our future government, there were only the details to arrange and agree upon. Those details are before you. It is not in our power to alter any of them even if the House desires it. If the House desires, it can *reject* the treaty, but we cannot, nor can the other Provinces which took part in its negotiation, consent that it shall be *altered* in the slightest particular. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have detained the House so long, and was not aware till I had been some time on my legs, that my physical strength was so inadequate to the exposition of those few points which, not specially noticed by my predecessors in this debate, I undertook to speak upon. We stand at present in this position : we are bound in honour, we are bound in good faith, to four Provinces occupied by our fellow colonists, to carry out the measure of Union agreed upon here in the last week of October. We are bound to carry it to the foot of the Throne, and ask there from Her Majesty, according to the first resolution of the Address, that She will be graciously pleased to direct legislation to be had on this subject. We go to the Imperial Government, the common arbiter of us all, in our true Federal metropolis—we go there to ask for our fundamental Charter. - We hope, by having that Charter, which can only be amended by the authority that made it, that we will lay the basis of permanency for our future government. The two great things that all men aim at in free government, are liberty and permanency. We have had liberty enough—too much, perhaps, in some respects—but, at all events, liberty to our hearts' content. There is not on the face of the earth a freer people than the inhabitants of these colonies. But it is necessary there should be respect for the law, a high central authority, the virtue of civil obedience, obeying the law for the law's sake ; for even when a man's private conscience may convince him sufficiently that the law in some cases may be wrong, he is not to set up his individual will against the will of the country expressed through its recog-

nised constitutional organs. We need in these Provinces, and we can bear, a large infusion of authority. I am not at all afraid this Constitution errs on the side of too great conservatism. If it be found too conservative now, the downward tendency in political ideas which characterises this democratic age, is a sufficient guarantee for amendment. Its conservatism is the principle on which this instrument is strong, and worthy of the support of every colonist, and through which it will secure the warm approbation of the Imperial authorities. We have here no traditions and ancient venerable institutions; here, there are no aristocratic elements hallowed by time or bright deeds; here, every man is the first settler of the land, or removed from the first settler one or two generations at the farthest; here, we have no architectural monuments calling up old associations; here, we have none of those old popular legends and stories which in other countries have exercised a powerful share in the government; here, every man is the son of his own works. (Hear, hear.) We have none of those influences about us which, elsewhere, have their effect upon government just as much as the invisible atmosphere itself tends to influence life, and animal and vegetable existence. This is a new land—a land of young pretensions because it is new; because classes and systems have not had that time to grow here naturally. We have no aristocracy but of virtue and talent, which is the best aristocracy, and is the old and true meaning of the term. (Hear, hear.) There is a class of men rising in these colonies, superior in many respects to others with whom they might be compared. What I should like to see, is—that fair representatives of the Canadian and Acadian aristocracy should be sent to the foot of the Throne with that scheme, to obtain for it the royal sanction—a scheme not suggested by others, or imposed upon us, but one the work of ourselves, the creation of our own intellect and of our own free, unbiassed, and untrammelled will. I should like to see our best men go there, and endeavour to have this measure carried through the Imperial Parliament—going into Her Majesty's presence, and by their manner, if not

actually by their speech, saying—"During Your Majesty's reign we have had Responsible Government conceded to us: we have administered it for nearly a quarter of a century, during which we have under it doubled our population, and more than quadrupled our trade. The small colonies which your ancestors could hardly see on the map, have grown into great communities. A great danger has arisen in our near neighbourhood. Over our homes a cloud hangs, dark and heavy. We do not know when it may burst. With our own strength we are not able to combat against the storm; but what we can do, we will do cheerfully and loyally. We want time to grow; we want more people to fill our country, more industrious families of men to develop our resources; we want to increase our prosperity; we want more extended trade and commerce; we want more land tilled—more men established through our wastes and wildernesses. We of the British North-American Provinces want to be joined together, that, if danger comes, we can support each other in the day of trial. We come to Your Majesty, who have given us liberty, to give us unity, that we may preserve and perpetuate our freedom; and whatsoever charter, in the wisdom of Your Majesty and of Your Parliament, you give us, we shall loyally obey and observe as long as it is the pleasure of Your Majesty and Your Successors to maintain the connection between Great Britain and these Colonies." (Loud cheers.)

THE END