TWO SPEECHES

ON

THE UNION OF THE PROVINCES,

BY

HON. THOS. D'ARCY M'GEE, M.R.I.A.,

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE, CANADA, &c., &c.

Quebec:

PRINTED BY HUNTER, ROSE & CO., 26, ST. URSULE STREET.

1865.

TWO SPEECHES

ON

THE UNION OF THE PROVINCES,

BY

HON. THOS. D'ARCY McGEE, M.R.I.A.,

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE, CANADA, &c., &c.

Quebec:
PRINTED BY HUNTER, ROSE & CO., 26, ST. URSULE STREET.
1865.

THE

UNION OF THE PROVINCES.

NOTE.—At the request of several friends throughout the Province, the following Speeches, (the first delivered at Cookshire, County of Compton, December 22, 1864, the second in the Legislative Assembly, on the 9th February, 1865,) have been printed in their present form.

QUEBEC, *March* 1, 1865.

HON. Mr. McGEE on rising, was received with cheering, and said :—

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,—

I promised my respected friend, your county member, Mr. POPE, to meet him at the recent public dinner given to my colleague, Mr. GALT, at Sherbrooke, and to come over here with him to Compton to speak to you on the subject of British American Union. I was, greatly to my regret, prevented, by a sudden and sharp illness, from being present at the Sherbrooke dinner; for there is no public man in Canada whose services to the Union deserve all honorable acknowledgment more than Mr. GALT—(cheers)—and there is no place in the country I had rather discuss this question than in "the Eastern Townships." (Cheers.) I am here to make good your member's promise in my behalf, and I am deeply thankful that I am able to be here, and have still a voice to raise in behalf of this cause. (Cheers.) This is a border country—it is a country actually undergoing its colonization—it is the home of a mixed people, various in origin, in language, and in creed—and, therefore, a very fit place to consider propositions which must interest men of all languages, origins, and creeds, which involve all our future relations among ourselves and with our neighbours, internal and external. So far as I can help it, gentlemen, I will not trouble you with what has been said before by my colleague in the Government at other meetings, but I will endeavour to give you my own views on the nature of the constitutional developments which have been projected by the late Colonial Conferences, to show on what principle the project stands, to illustrate by comparison and contrast the merits of our design, and to show, in closing, its special adaptability to our present situation as British American Provincial communities.

THE TIME FAVORABLE.

At the start I cannot but congratulate the people of all the Provinces on the fortunate conjunction of circumstances which makes this the best possible time for a searching examination and a thorough overhauling of our political system. When I was in the Eastern Provinces last summer—when the Conferences were still a thing to come—I appealed on behalf of the project to the press and the public there, that it should not be prejudged, and I must say I think a very great degree of forbearance and good feeling was manifested in this respect. But I should be sorry, speaking for myself, now that the stage of intelligent discussion has been reached, now that we have got something before us to discuss, that such a vast scheme should pass, if that were possible, *sub silentio*. So far from deprecating discussion now, I should welcome it, for there could not be, there never can be, a more propitious time for such a discussion than the present. (Cheers.) Under the mild sway of a Sovereign, whose reign is coincident with responsible government in these colonies—a

Sovereign whose personal virtues have rendered monarchical principles respectable even to those who prefer abstractedly the republican system—with peace and prosperity at present within our own borders—we are called on to consider what further constitutional safeguards we need to carry us on for the future in the same path of peaceable progression.

UNION, THE MOT D'ORDRE.

And never, surely, gentlemen, did the wide field of American public life present so busy and so instructive a prospect to the thoughtful observer as in this same good year of grace, 1864. Overlooking all minor details, what do we find—the one prevailing and all but universal characteristic of American politics in those days? Is it not that "Union" is at this moment throughout the entire new world the *mot d'ordre* of States and statesmen? If we look to the far South, we perceive a Congress of Central American States endeavoring to recover their lost unity; if we draw down to Mexico, we perceive her new Emperor endeavoring to establish his throne upon the basis of union; if we come farther north, we find eleven States battling for a new Union, and twenty-five on the other side battling to restore the old Union. (Cheers.) The New World has evidently had new lights, and all its states and statesmen have at last discovered that liberty without unity is like rain in the desert, or rain upon granite—it produces nothing, it sustains nothing, it profiteth nothing. (Cheers.) From the bitter experience of the past, the Confederate States have seen the wisdom, among other things, of giving their ministers seats in Congress, and extending the tenure of executive office fifty per cent beyond the old United States period; from bitter experience, also, the most enlightened, and what we may consider the most patriotic among the Mexicans, desiring to establish the inviolability of their executive as the foundation of all stable government, have not hesitated to import, not "a little British Prince," but an Austrian Archduke, a descendent of their ancient kings, as a tonic to their shattered constitution. Now, gentlemen, all this American experience, Northern, Southern and Central, is as accessible to us as to the electors of Mr. LINCOLN or Mr. DAVIS, or the subjects of the Emperor MAXIMILLIAN: it lies before us, an open volume, and invites us to well read, mark and digest its contents. (Cheers.) It was with a view to contribute my mite at the present stage of the discussion, that I accepted Mr. POPE's kind invitation, and am now here to offer you as clear a view as I can put into words, of the process of reasoning and observation by which those who composed the late Conferences arrived at the decisions at which they have arrived, in relation to the constitution and powers of the General and Local Governments in the future Confederation. (Hear, hear.) You have probably all read in the newspapers what purported to be the text—and it was very near the text—of the conclusions arrived at. You have no doubt all read Mr. BROWN's explanations at Toronto, and Mr. GALT's further explanations at Sherbrooke; you have probably also seen two other expressions of opinion, on the general question, in the journals of the day, one from the Honorable Mr. DORION, who is opposed to all union, except some sort of Federation of the Canadas; another from the Honorable Mr. HILLYARD CAMERON, who would much prefer a legislative to a federative union. I don't say that if it could be had by common consent, I would not be prepared to agree with Mr. CAMERON; but a legislative union, under our circumstances, was simply out of the question. We might as well ask for the moon, and keep asking until we could get it. (Laughter.) It was a question between some form of federative union or no union at all; and I am not at all prepared to say with Mr. DORION, and never was, that the greater union is not the most desirable, if conditions can be settled satisfactorily to all parties. (Cheers.) It seems to me—and in saying so I intend no shadow of disrespect to the honorable member for Hochelaga—that the man who can seriously maintain that union is not strength, that five or six comparatively small communities, owning a common allegiance, existing side by side on the same continent, in the presence of much larger communities owning another allegiance, would not be stronger and safer united than separate, that such a one puts himself out of the pale of all rational argument.

THE DEFENCE QUESTION.

I will take as an instance of the irrationality of such an argument—the particular question, the great test question remaining between Canada and England: the question of defence. (Hear, hear.) The future General Government has reserved to itself,

saving the sovereignty of England, the control of our militia and military expenditure. Every one can see that a war with England and the United States would be largely a naval war, and such a naval war as the ocean has never before seen—(hear, hear)—a war that would interest and stir the heart of England even beyond the pitch that made her staid merchants astonish LLOYD's in 1813, with "three times three cheers," when they heard that the "Shannon" had fought and captured, and carried the "Chesapeake" a prize into Halifax harbour. (Cheers.) Suppose, then, in the event of an invasion of our soil, either in Upper Canada or Lower Canada—suppose that a flotilla was needed on the St. Lawrence, or on Lake Ontario; that England could spare us the gunboats, but not the skilled seamen; would it be no advantage to Canada to have the 50,000 Atlantic sailors of the Lower Provinces, to call upon for their contingent to such a service? No doubt the empire could call on them now, but unless it restored the press-gang it could not make them come. But if by our union we gave that valuable class of men the feeling of common country; if by the intercourse and commerce which must follow on our union, that feeling grew to the strength of identity, we would have enough help of that description—drawn from what my colleague Hon. Mr. CARTIER calls the maritime element—for the asking. (Cheers.) The Imperial power, having conceded to all the North American colonies responsible government, can only secure their co-operation, even in military measures, through those several separate governments. (Hear, hear.) Every one can see at a glance how much the Imperial power, and we ourselves, would gain in any emergency—if there were but two governments instead of six to be consulted—how much in promptitude, in decision, in time, in unanimity, and in effectiveness. I need not enlarge, I am sure, on so self evident a proposition as this; the man that will not see it, will not, that is all I need and on that score. (Laughter.) It has, indeed, been asserted by the sceptics in our work that all our theories of a closer commercial intercourse are chimerical; and yet, oddly enough, these are the same people who think a commercial union would "secure all the benefits" of this chimerical prospect. (Laughter.) Well, I will not meet assertion by assertion, but I will answer a conjecture by a fact. At the very time the member for Hochelaga was issuing his rather inconsistent declaration against a political union as among other reasons, wholly unprofitable in a commercial point of view—and in favor of a commercial union as all that was to be desired in itself,—at that moment, the first steamship, laden with breadstuffs, direct from Montreal to Newfoundland, was dropping down the St. Lawrence, as a result of the partial and brief intercourse, brought about between the two communities, through our Conference at Quebec! That is a fact not very important in itself, perhaps, but very indicative of the possible usefulness of Union in a commercial point of a view! (Cheers.) I may mention another fact: while we were lying in Charlottetown harbor last September, our attention was called to the arrival of a fine ocean-going steamship—one of a regular line between Boston and Prince Edward Island. The Boston people find the trade of that rich little island worth cultivating, and they do it; they know where there is produce and where there is a market, and they establish a line of steamers to run there; yet I am sure they sell nothing to the islanders which we, at third the distance, could not just as well supply them with from Quebec or Montreal. (Cheers.) I repeat, however, I will not argue so plain a point as that with provinces like ours, union is strength, is reputation, is credit, is security. I will just give one other illustration on this last head, and then I will drop the topic where it is: the security for peace which a large political organization has over a small one, lies not only in its greater interests and disposable force, but in this other consideration, that the aggressor must risk or lose the benefit of much larger transactions, in attacking a larger than in assailing a smaller, state. If, for example, in our system of defence—in addition to all the Imperial Government could do for us,—if we could, by our joint representative action, be sure to shut up the River St. John upon the people of Maine—to exclude from the gulf the fishermen of Massachusetts—to withhold from the hearths and furnaces of New England the coal of Cape Breton—no man can question but that we would wield several additional means of defence, not now at the command of Canada. And so with the Lower Provinces; if their statesmen could wield our forces and our resources in addition to their own, does any sane man pretend that would not be an immense gain to them? (Hear, hear.) I may be told

again the Imperial Government can do all this for us, if they will; I repeat that the Imperial Government alone can neither do any of these things so promptly, so fully, nor with so little trespass on our responsible governments, as a united legislature could, through an united public force, with the aid of a Federal treasury. I really, gentlemen, ought to beg your pardon—and I do so—for dwelling so long on the truism that union is, in our case, strength; but as the first proposition to which we all agreed at the first Conference, I thought I would give some explanation why we had unanimously arrived at that result. (Cheers.)

FEDERALISM AND IMPERIALISM.

Another objector opposes our project because Colonial Union is inconsistent with Imperial connexion. Well, to that we might answer that we are quite willing to leave it to the statesmen of the empire themselves to decide that point. If England does not find it so, I think we may safely assume it is not so. And, in point of fact, the Imperial Parliament several years ago decided the question when they passed the New Zealand Constitutional Act, establishing six or seven local governments, under one general government, in that colony. (Cheers.) Still another objector contends that the complement of Federalism is Republicanism, because most of the States with which we are familiar as Federal States, are also Republics. But this objection is by no means unanswerable. It is true Switzerland is a Republic in the sense of having no hereditary head, but the United Netherlands, when a Confederacy, were not a republic in that sense; it is true the United States and Mexico, and the Argentine Federations were all republican in basis and theory; but it is also true that the German Confederation is, and has always been, predominantly monarchical. There might be half as many varieties of federal governments as there are states or provinces in the world; there may be aristocratic federations—like the Venetian,—or monarchical, like the German—or democratic, like the United States: the only definition which really covers the whole species of governments of this description is, the political union of states of dissimilar size and resources, to secure external protection and internal tranquillity. (Cheers.) These are the two main objects of all confederacies of states, on whatever principles governed, locally or unitedly; federalism is a political co-partnership, which may be, and has been formed by Monarchists, Aristocrats, and Democrats, Pagans and Christians, under the most various circumstances, and in all periods of human history. (Cheers.) There may be almost as many varieties of confederation as of companies, in private and social life; we say, with propriety too, the company at the hotel, or the company who own the hotel, but the organization of each is widely different. Our Federation will be British; it will be of the fourth class of Lord COKE's division, *de mutui auxilii*—for mutual aid. The only element in it not British is the sectional equality provided for in the Upper House, a principle which is known to be alike applicable to the democratic confederation next us, and the monarchical confederation of Germany. (Hear, hear.)

THE QUEBEC PLAN CONSERVATIVE.

One more objection which comes from an opposite quarter to the last, is that our plan is too stringently conservative. Well, gentlemen I can but say to that—if it be so—that it is a good fault, which we may safely leave to the popular elements of our state of society to correct in time. It was remarked long ago by Lord BOLINGBROKE, and a greater than BOLINGBROKE has called it "a profound remark" —that it is easier to graft anything of a republic on a monarchy, than anything of monarchy on a republic. It is always easy in our society to extend democratic influence and democratic authority; but it is not always possible, it is very seldom possible, ever to get anything back that is once yielded up to democracy. (Hear, hear.) If, therefore, our plan should seem at first sight somewhat too conservative—I repeat my own opinion, that it is a good fault, and the remedy may safely be left to time. So much for what lawyers call the "general issue."

BRITISH AMERICAN CONFEDERATION PECULIAR.

You will probably like me to define, gentlemen, that particular adaptation of the federal system, which has lately found such high favor in the eyes of our leading colonial politicians. Well, this definition has been, I think, pretty accurately given in the published text,—or what professes to be the text,—of the results arrived at at Quebec. Don't be alarmed; I am not going to read you the whole seventy and odd propositions.

(Laughter.) It is, perhaps, sufficient for my purpose to give you, both by contrast and comparison, a broad, general view of what is, and what is not included in this constitutional charter. In the first place, I may say, gentlemen, to take the most familiar comparison, that we proceeded in almost an inverse ratio to the course taken in the United States, at the formation of their constitution. We began by dutifully acknowledging the sovereignty of the Crown, as they did by boldly declaring their total separation from their former Sovereign. Unlike our neighbors we have had no questions of sovereignty to raise. (Hear, hear.) We have been saved from all embarrassment on the subject of sovereignty, by simply recognising it as it already exists, in the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland. There, for us, the sovereign power of peace and war, life and death, receiving and sending ambassadors, still resides, so long as Her Majesty and her descendants retain the allegiance of the people of these Provinces. (Cheers.) No doubt some inconvenience may arise from the habitual personal absence of the Sovereign; but even this difficulty—now that the Atlantic is an eight day ferry, is not insuperable. Next, we made the general, the supreme Government and the local derivative; while the Americans did just the reverse. (Cheers.)

ITS CONTRAST WITH THE AMERICAN.

As to the merits and the consequences of this fundamental difference, I shall only say this, that merely to differ from another, and a sometime-established system, is, of course, no merit in itself; but yet, if we are to be a distinct people from our republican neighbors, we can only be so and remain so, by the assertion of distinct principles of government,—a far better boundary than the River St. Lawrence, or the ASHBURTON line. (Cheers.) But suppose their fundamental politics to be right, would we then, for the sake of distinction, erect a falsehood at the North, to enable us to contend against a truth at the South? Would we establish monarchy merely out of a spirit of antagonism? No! gentlemen, God forbid! I of course hold, not only that our plan of government is politic in itself, but also, that it is better than the American. I am prepared to maintain this at all times—against all comers: for if I had not myself faith in our work, I should scorn to inculcate its obligations on the public. (Cheers.) We build, as I said the other day at Montreal, on the old foundations—though the result of our deliberations is popularly called "the new constitution." I deny that the principles on which we proceeded, are novel or untried principles. These principles all exist, and for ages have existed in the British Constitution. Some of the contrivances and adaptations of principles are new—but the Royal authority, Ministerial responsibility, a nominative Upper House, the full and free representation of the Commons, and the independence of the Judges, are not inventions of our making. (Cheers.) We offer you no political patent medicine warranted to cure everything, nor do we pretend that our work is a perfect work; but if we cannot make it perfect, we have at least left it capable of revision, by the concurrence of the parties to the present settlement, and the same supreme authority from which we seek the original sanction of our plan. (Cheers.) Still it is to be hoped that the necessity for any revision will seldom occur, for I am quite sure the people of these provinces will never wish to have it said of their constitution, what the French bookseller of the last century said so wittily, on being asked for the French Constitution—that he did not deal in periodical publications. (Cheers and laughter.) We build on the old foundations, and I trust I may say, in the spirit of the ancient founders, as well. The matrix of the monarchical form of Government is humility, self-denial, obedience, and holy fear. I know these are not nineteenth century virtues—(laughter)—neither are they plants indigenous to the soil of the New World. Because it is a new world, as yet undisciplined, pride and self-assertion, and pretension, are more common, than the great family of humble virtues, whose names I have named. Pure democracy is very like pride—it is the "good-as-you" feeling carried into politics. (Laughter.) It asserts an unreal equality between youth and age, subject and magistrate, the weak and the strong, the vicious and the virtuous. But the same virtues which feed and nourish filial affection, and conjugal peace in private life, are essential to uphold civil authority; and these are the virtues on which the monarchical form of Government alone can be maintained.

DISCUSSION RENDERED POSSIBLE BY RECENT EVENTS.

There was a time when such a doctrine as

this, which I am now inculcating here, in Compton, could hardly get a patient hearing in any part of North America; but that time is fortunately past away: it is possible in our days, even for republican writers to admit the merits of the monarchical system, without being hooted into silence, as the elder ADAMS was when he published in Philadelphia, towards the end of the last century, his eloquent *Discourses on Davila*. His grandson and editor, the present able Minister at the Court of St. James, tells us how the printer was intimidated from proceeding with the publication, and that it was the great cause of his ancestor's life long-unpopularity; and for what? Because he maintained, with BURKE, WASHINGTON, BOSSUET, and SHAKSPERE, the divine origin of society, as against the theory of its human origin, upheld by JEFFERSON, PAINE, ROUSSEAU, and JOHN LOCKE. JOHN ADAMS could be President of the United States, but he could not get a printer to publish a general treatise on government which admitted the merits of monarchy —which contended that there was "a natural aristocracy at Boston as well as at Madrid"— and the intolerant outcry then raised against him for the *Discourses of Davila* pursued him to the grave. (Hear.) Another American, of even higher mental mark than President ADAMS—perhaps the very first intellect of all the authors of the American system—was on the same ground equally suspected, and equally abused; ALEXANDER HAMILTON, in his original plan of the American Constitution, offended in the same way as ADAMS by advocating "a solid and coercive union" with "complete sovereignty in Congress"—and we all know how, down almost to yesterday, his memory was branded as that of an enemy of the country he did so much to bring into existence. No wonder political science has been at a stand-still for fifty years on this continent, when no man, however high his position, dared raise a negative to the prevailing democratic theories, without permission of the clamorous majority for the time being. (Cheers.) At last— and almost simultaneously the negative has been raised at the extremes of North America—Mexico and Canada—and we, at least here, we have no fear that our printers will be bullied into silence like the printer of President ADAMS. (Cheers.) We have not conceived our system in a spirit of antagonism to our next neighbors; we will still have enough in common with them constitutionally to obviate any very zealous propaganda ism on either part; but we will also have enough left of our ancestral system to distinguish permanently our people from their people— our institutions from their institutions—and our history (when we shall have a history) from their history. (Cheers.)

MEXICO AND CANADA.

I have referred, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, to the assertion of somewhat similar principles to our own now being made in Mexico. It would be strange if Canada should reach, by deliberation and forethought, the same results which Mexico has grasped at out of the miserable depths of her long anarchy (Cheers.) We are not yet informed whether the new Emperor designs to consolidate his provinces, or to leave them their local organizations; but this I know, that with all the immense natural advantages of Mexico, I should, for my part, rather take my chance for the permanent establishment of a free monarchy in the North than in Mexico. (Cheers.) We have already solved for ourselves one great problem—the legal relation of Church and State—which is still before the rulers of Mexico. If we have but half the population, we have three times the number of men of pure European race that Mexico has; and while I own that I wish every success to the Mexican Empire, under the auspices of France, I have, I confess, still stronger hopes for the successful establishment of the free kingdom of Canada, under the auspices of Great Britain. (Cheers.)

> "For fiery, fierce and fickle is the South;
> But loving, dark and tender is the North."
> —(Cheers.)

BRITISH AMERICAN FEDERALISM ESSENTIALLY CONSERVATIVE.

We have also solved—so far as the late Conferences could do so, for these provinces—the relation of the Crown to the people,—the sphere of the prerogative, and the sphere of the suffrage. We have preserved every British principle now in use among us, and we have recovered one or two that were well nigh lost; we have been especially careful not to trench on the prerogative of the Crown, as to the powers, rank, or income of its future representative on this continent; as to the dignity of the office, or the style and title of the future kingdom or viceroyalty, or by whatever other name it may be Her Majesty's pleasure to designate hereafter her dominions on this continent. (Cheers.) Next to the United States, we have the most

extended suffrage in the New World; some think quite too far extended; but in our state of society, I do not see how that is to be avoided, in the selection at least, of the tax-imposing House of Parliament. We have, besides, restored to the Crown one of its essential attributes when, as the fountain of honor, we leave to the Sovereign the confirmation of the second, the smaller and more Conservative Chamber; and we preserve for the Crown its other great attribute,—as the fountain of justice, by retaining its right to appoint the Judges,—of course upon the advice of the Constitutional Councillors of the Queen in this country, who are in turn responsible to Parliament and the people for their advice and appointments. (Cheers.) We have provided also, in our new arrangements, that the tenure of all offices, shall be good behavior, in contradistinction to the "spoils principle" of our next neighbors. In all these respects we have built on the old foundations, in the spirit of the old wisdom—and we have faith, therefore, that our work will stand. (Loud cheers.)

DIFFICULTIES IN THE WAY.

Naturally, gentlemen, we cannot expect that our course will be all plain sailing. We shall have our difficulties, as all states have had; and this brings me to refer to the powers remaining in the possession of the local legislatures. The difference of language between the majority of Lower Canada, and the majority of the whole union is a difficulty; but it is a difficulty which almost every other nation has had and has solved: in Belgium they have at least two languages, in Switzerland they have three chief languages—German, French, and Italian; the Federal form of Government, the compromise between great states and small, seems peculiarly adapted to conciliate difficulties of this description, and to keep politically together men of different origins and languages. (Hear, hear.) I confess, I have less anxiety on this score than I have on another—the proper protection of the minority in origin and religion in Upper and Lower Canada respectively. (Hear, hear.) On this point there is no doubt a good deal of natural anxiety felt in the Townships, as there is among my own constituents in Montreal, and I have no doubt you would like me to enlarge upon it as the point most immediately interesting to yourselves.

RIGHTS OF MINORITIES.

I am, as you are, interested in the due protection of the rights of the minority, not only as an English-speaking member in Lower Canada, but as interested naturally and reasonably for my co-religionists, who form the minority in Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.) I am persuaded as regards both minorities, that they can have abundant guarantees, sacred beyond the reach of sectarian or sectional domination—for all their rights, civil and religious. (Hear, hear and cheers.) If we had failed to secure every possible constitutional guarantee for our minorities, east and west, I am sure the gentleman who may be considered your special representative at the Conference—(Hon. Mr. GALT)—and I am equally sure, that I myself, could have been no party, to the conclusions of the late Conference. (Loud cheers.) But we both believed—and all our Canadian colleagues went with us in this belief—that in securing the power of disallowance, under circumstances which might warrant it, to the General Government, in giving the appointment of Judges and Local Governors to the General Government, and in expressly providing in the Constitution for the educational rights of the minority, we had taken every guarantee, legislative, judicial and educational, against the oppression of a sectional minority by the sectional majority. (Cheers.) You will have for your guarantee the Queen's name,—which I think the case of Ottawa has shown is not without power in Canada; you will have the subordination of the local to the general authority, provided in the constitutional charter itself, and you will have, besides, the great material guarantee, that in the General Government you will be two-th rds of the whole told by language, and a clear majority counted by creed; and if with these odds you cannot protect your own interests, it will be the first time you ever failed to do so. (Cheers.) The Protestant minority in Lower Canada and the Catholic minority in Upper Canada may depend upon it the General Government will never see them oppressed—even if there were any disposition to oppress them—which I hope there is not in Upper Canada; which I am pretty sure there is not in Lower Canada. (Cheers.) No General Government could stand for a single session under the new arrangements without Catholic as well as Protestant support; in fact, one great good to be expected from the larger interest

with which that Government will have to deal will be, that local prejudices, and all other prejudices, will fall more and more into contempt, while our statesmen will rise more and more superior to such low and pitiful politics. (Loud cheers.) What would be the effect of any set of men, in any subdivision of the Union, attempting for example, the religious ascendancy of any race or creed? Why, the direct effect would be to condemn themselves and their principles to insignificance in the General Government. Neither you here, nor the Catholic minority in Upper Canada will owe your local rights and liberties to the forbearance or good will of the neighboring majority; neither of you will tolerate being tolerated; but all your special institutions, religious and educational, as well as all your general and common franchises and rights, will be secured under the broad seal of the empire, which the strong arm of the General Government will suffer no bigot to break, and no province to lay its finger on, should any one be foolish enough to attempt it. (Cheers.)

THE SCHEME AS A WHOLE.

This is the frame of government we have to offer you, and to this system, when fully understood, I am certain you will give a cheerful and a hearty adherence. (Cheers.) We offer the good people of these colonies jointly a system of government which will secure to them ample means of preserving external and internal peace; we offer to them the common profits of a trade, which was represented in 1863, by imports and exports, to the gross value of 137,000,000 of dollars, and by a sea-going and lake tonnage of 12,000,000 of tons. We offer to each other special advantages in detail. The Maritime Provinces give us a right of way and free outports for five months out of every year; we give them what they need, direct connexion with the great producing regions of the North-west all the year round. This connexion, if they do not get through Canada, they must ultimately get through the United States; and one reason why I, in season, and perhaps, out of season, have continued an advocate for an Intercolonial Railway was, that the first and closest and most lasting connection of those Lower Provinces, with the continental trade system, might be established by, and through, and in union with, Canada. (Cheers.) I do not pretend that mere railway connexion will make trade between us and them, but I am quite sure we can have no considerable intercourse, no exchanges or accounts *pro* or *con* without such a connexion both for postal and travelling purposes. I rejoice, moreover, that we, men of insular origin, are about to recover one of our lost senses—the sense that comprehends the sea—(Cheers)—that we are not now about to subside into a character so foreign to all our antecedents, that of a mere inland people. The Union of the Provinces restores us to the ocean, takes us back to the Atlantic, and launches us once more on the modern Mediterranean, the true central sea of the western world. (Cheers.) But it is not for its material advantages, by which we may enrich each other, nor its joint political action, by which we may protect each other, that the Union is only to be valued; it is because it will give, as it only can give, a distinct historical existence to British America. If it should be fortunately safely established and wisely upheld, mankind will find here, standing side by side, on this half-cleared continent, the British and American forms of free government; here we shall have the means of comparison and contrast in the greatest affairs; here we shall have principles tested to their last results, and maxims inspected and systems gauged, and schools of thought, as well as rules of state, reformed and revised, founded and refounded. (Cheers.) All that wholesome stimulus of variety which was wanting to the intellect of Rome under the first emperors, will be abundantly supplied out of our own circumstances and those of our neighbours, so that no CICERO need ever, by personal considerations, enter into indefensible inconsistencies, and no TACITUS be forced to disguise his virtuous indignation at public corruption, under the thin veil of an outlandish allegory. (Cheers.) I may be sanguine for the future of this country,—but if it be an error of judgment to expect great things of young countries, as of young people who are richly endowed by nature, and generously nurtured, then it is an error I never hope to amend. (Cheers.) And here let me say, that it is for the young men of all the provinces we who labor to bring about the Confederation are especially working: it is to give them a country wide enough and diversified enough to content them all, that we labor; it is to erect a standard worthy to engage their affections and ambition; it is to frame a system which shall blend the best principles

with the best manners, which shall infuse the spirit of honor into the pursuit of politics, that we have striven—and who can be more interested for our success than the young men of the Provinces, who are to carry on the country into another century? (Cheers.)

RELATIONS WITH UNITED STATES.

We in our time, hope to do our duty; not only in "lengthening the cords and strengthening the stakes" of our constitutional system, with a view to that future, but in guarding jealously in the perilous present, the honor and integrity of this province. I may say to you here, on the Eastern frontier, that the Government of the day are fully informed of all the machinations that have been set on foot, within and without our borders, to drive, or tempt, or trick Canada, out of that straightforward neutrality commanded by the Queen's Proclamation four years ago. So far, we have been enabled to maintain that neutrality in the letter, as well as in the spirit, and I trust we may be equally successful in doing so, so long as it may be required. (Cheers.) I am well convinced there is no Canadian who would wish his Government to make any base compliance—to overdo or overstrain any legal obligation—in order to buy for us the inestimable boon of peace; but I am equally convinced, and you will agree with me I feel confident, that all that can be done by way of prevention, however onerous or costly it may be to us a province, ought to be done to maintain friendly relations with our neighbors, so far as they will enable us to do so. The rest depends on them,—on the fairness of their statesmen and their military authorities; but come what may in the future, at all events we must see that Canada does its duty, and its whole duty, cheerfully, fully, and fearlessly. (Cheers.)

IS THE QUEBEC PLAN GENERALLY TO BE APPROVED?

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I beg your forgiveness for the great length to which these remarks have detained you. But our general plan having already found its way to the public, I was anxious to show our countrymen, here and at home, in a plain, popular way, the processes of reasoning and the guiding principles by which we arrived at the results at which we have arrived. I should blush for myself, and grieve for my colleagues, if we were any of us capable of picking up our principles in a panic, without inquiry or reflection, or examination. (Cheers) I need hardly assure you, gentlemen, that nothing was done or said at Quebec or Charlottetown without full deliberation, and very hard work. It would be invidious to name names in connection with what was regarded by all engaged as a confidential discussion; but while I cheerfully recognize in our countrymen of the Lower Provinces the noble qualities they exhibited throughout the whole of these transactions, I must say, I was proud of Canada's part in them also. (Cheers.) I was proud of the self-control, the ability, the acquirements, and the disinterested unanimity of our colleagues, from Upper as well as from Lower Canada. (Cheers.) And, now, gentlemen, that the architects have completed their plan, it is for you to say shall the building be put up? It is for you, and for your representatives in Parliament,—for my friend Mr. POPE and the other Township members—for the people of the Maritime Provinces and their representatives to say, whether this great work is to be carried, with all due diligence, to its completion. If the design should seem to you as wise and fit as it seems to us, then fling all misgivings far behind you and go ahead! Let no local prejudice impede, let no personal ambition obstruct, the great work. Why! the very Aborigines of the land might have instructed the sceptics among ourselves that union was strength. What was it gave at one time the balance of power on this soil to "the Six Nations,"—so that England, France and Holland all sought the alliance of the red-skinned statesmen of Onondago? What was it made the names of BRANT, and PONTIAC, and TECUMSETH so formidable in their day? Because they too had conceived the idea—an immense stride for the savage intellect to make—that union was strength. (Cheers.) Let the personalities and partizanship of our times stand abashed in the presence of those forest-born Federalists, who rose superior to all mere tribal prejudices in endeavoring to save a whole people. (Loud cheers.) And now, my friends of the County of Compton, once more receive my grateful thanks; have no fears for the rights of the minority, but be watchful as you ought to be, and as I am sure your worthy member (who is always at his post when your interests are at stake) will be. (Cheers.) The Parliament of Canada is, as

you are aware, called by His Excellency for despatch of business at Quebec, on the 19th of January; it is an early call; and I am sure you all feel it will be an important session. I am, I do assure you, persuaded in my inmost mind, that these are the days of destiny for British America; that our opportunity to determine our own future, under the favor of Divine Providence, is upon us; that there is a tide in the affairs of nations, as well as of men, and that we are now at the flood of that tide. (Loud cheers.) Whether the men who have this great duty in charge may be found equal to the task, remains to be proved by their votes; but for my part, I am hopeful for the early and mutually advantageous union of all the provinces; for the early and firm establishment of our monarchial Confederation on this continent. (Loud cheers—amid which the hon. gentleman resumed his seat.)

Legislative Assembly, *Thursday*, *February* 9, 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;

The Honorable Mr. McGEE said—Mr. Speaker, I rise to endeavor 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 Lower Canada. The same night, my hon. 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 feign 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. (Hear, hear.) We all remember that in the nursery legend of the Three Kings of Cologne, Caspar brought myhrr, 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 relation to the present crisis.

Proposed treatment of the subject.

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 disentombed an old newspaper article of mine, entitled "A New Nationality," and endeavored 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, about to be adopted by all the colonies under such favorable circumstances. I do not think it ought to be made a matter of reproach to me, or a cause for belittleing 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 honorable member for Hochelaga himself. One is reminded by this sort of thing, of Puff in the *Critic*. "Two people" happened "to hit upon the same thought, and SHAKSPERE made use of it first—that's all." (Laughter.) My honorable friend is in this respect, no doubt, the SHAKSPERE of the new nationality. (Renewed laughter.) If there is anything in the article he has read to the House which is deserving of disapprobation, he is *particepts crimines*, and equally blameable if not more blameable than myself. He is indeed the older sinner, and I bow to him in that character with all proper humility. (Renewed laughter.) 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 hon. 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, sir, we may safely 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 this stage there are a few men who, having struggled for it in its earlier difficulties, will then deserve to be honorably mentioned. I shall not be guilty of the bad taste of complimenting those with whom I have the honor to be associated; but when we reach the stage of research, which lies far beyond the stage of deliberation in these affairs, there are some names that ought not to be forgotten.

ANTECEDENT HISTORY OF THE UNION.

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 a 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 did, 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, as we think we have already shown them, 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 hon gentleman formerly their colleague, 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 Coahtion, which led to the Quebec Conference, which led to the draft of the Constitution now on our table, which will lead, I am feign 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, addressed the public mind, and greatly contributed to give life and interest to this question, and indirectly to bring it to the happy position in which it now stands. Of those gentlemen I will mention two. I do not know whether hon. 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 hon. 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 Britannic 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 develope a national line of commercial and general policy, such as will prove adapted to the wants and exigencies of our position.

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 separate provinces, the individual

labored 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 scattered provinces. (Cheers.) Before I go further 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 which has been given to this subject since it has become a leading topic of public discussion in the Maritime and what I may call relatively to them, the Inland Provinces. It is astonishing how active has been the public mind 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 in the smallest of the provinces I have been able to 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 honorable ground from which alone this great subject can be taken in, in all its dimensions—had risen at once to the true dignity of this discussion with an elasticity that does honor to the communities that have exhibited it, and gives assurance that we have the metal, the material, out of which to construct a new and vigorous nationality. (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 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 observe, with some satisfaction, that the various orators and writers seem to be speaking or writing as if in the visible presence of all the colonies. (Hear, hear.) They are no longer hole-and-corner celebreties: 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 celebreties: if celebreties at all they must be celebreties 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 made a mental union among the people of all these provinces; and many men now speak with a dignity and carefulness which formerly did not characterize 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 signalized 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 appears 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 labor 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 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 favor of it. But the motives to such a comprehensive change as we propose, must be mixed motives—partly commercial, partly military, and partly poli-

tical; and I shall go over a few—not strained or simulated—motives which are entertained by many people of all these provinces, and 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 honorable 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 honorable gentlemen who are opposed to this 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 bagging the question; you have not yet proved that." Well, Mr. SPEAKER, what proofs do the gentlemen want? I presume there are three 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 politics, "Imperial connection." Secondly—His partner, comrade, or fellow-laborer, or near neighbor. And, thirdly,—The man himself, or the state itself. Now, in our case, all three causes 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 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 the responsibility for whatever 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 addenda to the treaty 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 neighbors 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 meaning 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 army of the 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 field. (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 ammunition and stock of war material at the opening of the war—that is to say, at the date of the attack upon Fort Sumpter—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 1,052 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 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 ironclads, carrying 4,610 guns, with a tonnage of 510,000 tons, and manned by a force of 51,000 men. These are frightful figures for the capacity of destruction they represent, for the heaps of carnage that they represent, for the quantity of human blood spilt that they represent, for the lust of conquest that they represent, for the evil passions that they represent, and for the arrest of the onward progress of civilization that 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 war-making neighbors. (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, took 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. He thus made Mr. BIRD-O-FREEDOM SAWIN sing:

> Ef you take a sword an' draw 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; by the army of contractors who are to feed and clothe and arm the 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 change that has come over 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 couple of 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, fifteen, twenty thousand human beings struck dead in one day would satisfy the jaded palate of men craving for excitement, and such horrible excitement as attended 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 neighbors are money, 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 Sumpter 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 moralizing 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-gathers have enough it? The manufacturers of false intelligence have enough of it? Who is it possible will have had enough of it? The fighting men themselves? I dare say they would all like to have a furlough, but all experiences teaches us, it is not of war soldiers tire but of peace; it is not of the sea soldiers 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 gypsy 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 seducive, disarming fallacy of my moralizing friend. (Hear, hear.) The Attorney General East told us in his speech the other night, that one of the features 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 New England element 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 two 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 mes-

senger 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. (Laughter.) All he had to do was, when one of the five successive governments which arose in two 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 disorganized 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 dare say, sir, we all remember the old class-book story of Mrs. THRALE'S "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 honorable gentleman in question—I dare say he was honorable, and a member of some House,—he, like all the rest of us expected to outlive 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 take heed of them and prepare for the possible future condition into which we may be plunged, woe 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 taken to the plan, I understand, but I do not believe that any member will get up in this House, and declare that he is an anti-unionist, that he is opposed to all 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 any 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 honorable 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 recognized; and all these had to be admitted as existing in a pretty advanced stage of development, when our Conferences were called together. (Hear, hear.) The lesson to be learned from this squandering 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 American 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 neighbors 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 pitched 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 afloat 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 labored 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 honorable 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 confrere, 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 neighbors; 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 favorable 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 quarupled 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 be 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 favor of Confederation as cheaply and as honorably 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.

These are the words of a statesman—of a mitred statesman—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. 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 favor of Confederation as cheaply and as honorably 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 here 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 lesser 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 consider 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 and appreciated, 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 neighbors 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 connexion. (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. When it was first 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 favor with Downing street, it excited the suspicions of the colonists; when it was

identified with the Quebec and Halifax railway project, it shared the 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 in 1858, 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 consent. (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 favorable to the bringing about of this union, and probably if we suffer this opportunity to be wasted we shall never see again such a conjunction of circumstances 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 endeavor to bring about a general union. This House formally gave the Government its confidence after the announcement of this policy, and although I have no desire to strain terms, it does appear to me that this House did commit itself to the principle of a union of the colonies if found 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 Honorable 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 Charlottetown 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 accom-

plished a body as I thought any new country in the world could produce,—and that some among them would compare not unfavorably 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 resources in debate; men of gentler manners; men more willing to bear and forbear, I never 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—by this extraordinary armistice of party warfare, obtained in every colony at the same moment —after all this labor 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 on your table. The propositions contained in it have been objected to, and we were reminded the other evening by the honorable member for Chateauguay, 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 coaction; and in this case there is the Imperial Despatch of 1862 to Lord MULGRAVE, Governor of Nova Scotia, distinctly authorizing the public men of the colonies to confer with each other on the subject of union, and writing them to submit the result of their conferences to the Imperial Government. (Hear, hear.) We assembled under authority of that despatch, and acted under the sanction it gave. 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—aye, or 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 anti-unionists. (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 who 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. gentleman 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.) It will be that body that will cause the several propositions to be moulded into a measure which will have the form of law, and these resolutions will probably be the *ipsissima 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 measure 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 of which other colonies are to agree, 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 Chauteauguay 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 ever 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 it to them in the most imperative moment—their representatives and ours have labored at it, letter and spirit, form and substance, until they found this basis of agreement, which we are all alike 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 honorable 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 will 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, and Charlottetown was their Port Joli; in the heart of Nova Scotia was that fair Acadian land, where the roll of LONGFELLOW'S noble hexameters may any day be heard in every wave that breaks upon the base of Cape Blomedon. (Cheers.) In the northern counties of New Brunswick, from the Miramachi to the Matapediac, 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 Acadian. 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:—

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-etre* 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 gaud

ly painted—the panels of a different color 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. A turn in the river very speedily hid from us the bridge and farm, our empty carriage, and the friends who had accompanied us from Grand Falls standing on the bank, in the evening sunshine, waving us their farewells, and it was not without pleasure that we felt that the same turn which screened them from our view, separated us for some time to come from civilized life.

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 recognize 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 two in Nova Scotia, and one in Newfoundland, 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 shall proceed with my outline 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 I., 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 Scotish 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 honor, that the Highlanders in all the 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, GAUVREAUS, 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, just as surely as they founded Upper Canada, for whom New Brunswick was made a separate province in 1794, as Upper Canada was for their relatives in 1791. Their descendants still flourish in the land, holding many positions of honor, 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, he was prepared to quit the benefit for politics. (Cheers.) There are other elements also not to be overlooked. The thrifty Germans of Lunenberg, 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 peo-

ple; in Nova Scotia, about eight; in the two Islands, very much 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 that 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 are 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 exclusively-minded Canadians out of it, that they cannot entertain 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 Hecuba to me, or I to Hecuba?" Well, I answer to that, know them and my word for it, you will like them. I have been on seven or eight journeys there, and 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 want to feel 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 with us, each will find something to like and respect in the other; mutual confidence and espect will follow, and a 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 special advocacy. (Hear, hear.) The thing who shuts up his heart against his kindred, his neighbors, 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-partizan, 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. gentleman 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 impossible to do so. Those boundaries extend to 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 Eng-

land—to St. John, 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, and 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 its 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. 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: I have prepared a statement on this subject, giving certain general results,—which I do not present as complete, but only as proximately correct—and which I now beg to read to the House:—

Province.	TERRITORY				POPULATION.			REPRESENTATION.		
	No. of Sq're Miles.	Comparative Size.	No. of Acres under Cultivation, 1863.	No. of Acres per Head.	No. of Persons, 1861.	Compar'tive Number.	No. of Persons per Square Mile.	—	No. of Members proposed.	No. of Persons represented by each Member.
Canada, Upper *	120,260	28.91	6,051,619	4.33	1,396,091	42.38	11.51	.....	85	17,025
" Lower	210,020	52.48	4,804,235	4.32	1,111,566	33.75	5.29	.....	65	17,101
Nova Scotia	18,671	4.45	1,027,702	3.10	330,857	10.04	17.72	.....	19	17,413
New Brunswick	27,105	6.46	855,108	3.25	252,047	7.65	9.29	.....	15	16,803
Prince Edward Island	2,173	0.51	300,000	3.70	80,857	2.45	37.20	.....	8	15,329
Newfoundland	40,200	9.58	.....	.....	122,638	3.73	3.05	.....	5	16,171
Totals	419,429	100.00	13,018,764	4.10	† 3,294,056	100.00	7.85	.....	194	16,979

* Canada.—The extent in square miles refers to known or surveyed land, as the real extent is not known.

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

Provinces.	DEBT. 1863. Amount.	Comparative.	Amount per Head.	REVENUE. 1863. Amount.	Comparative.	Amount per Head.	EXPENDITURE. 1863. Amount.	Comparative.	Amount per Head.	EXCESS Of Expenditure.	Of Revenue.
	$		$	$		$	$		$	$	$
Canada	67,293,994	85.14	26 82	9,760,316	77.94	3 89	10,742,807	80.46	4 28	982,491	.....
Nova Scotia	4,858,547	6.14	14 68	1,385,629	9.46	3 58	1,077,274	8.04	3 24	.....	313,355
New Brunswick	5,702,991	7.21	22 62	899,991	7.18	3 56	884,613	6.62	3 50	.....	15,378
Prince Edward Island	244,673	0.31	2 97	197,384	1.58	2 44	171,718	1.29	2 12	.....	25,666
Newfoundland (1862)	946,000	1.20	7 71	480,000	3.84	3 91	479,420	3.59	3 90	.....	580
Totals	$79,012,205	100.00	$23 98	$12,523,320	100.00	$3 80	$13,350,832	100.00	$4 05	$982,491	$354,979

Province.	IMPORTS. 1863. Amount.	Comparative.	Amount per Head.	EXPORTS. 1863. Amount.	Comparative.	Amount per Head.	— 1863. Tonnage—In and Out.	Average Tariffs.
	$		$	$		$	$	
Canada	45,964,000	65.10	18 12	41,841,000	62.58	16 68	2,133,000	20 ℔ cent.
Nova Scotia	10,210,391	14.46	30 26	8,420,668	12.58	25 45	1,431,953	10 ℔ cent.
New Brunswick	7,764,824	11.00	30 80	8,984,784	13.44	35 56	1,386,980	15½ ℔ cent.
Prince Edward Island	1,428,028	2.02	17 66	1,627,540	2.43	20 12	No return.	11 ℔ cent.
Newfoundland	5,242,720	7.42	42 75	6,003,212	8.97	48 96	"	10 ℔ cent.
							(6,997,000	Lake.)
Totals	$70,600,963	100.00	$21 43	$66,846,604	100.00	$20 29	$11,854,934	13.3 ℔ cent.

But there is one special source of wealth to be found in the Maritime Provinces, which was not in my detail exhibited by my honorable 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 conclude 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 forever? 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 coal fields in New Brunswick has been recently determined to be 7,500 square miles; 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 rivers, 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 2¾ 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 this 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 that 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 all 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 must 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 fight 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 arrangements 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, dependant 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, and he is said 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 Ed-

ward 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 conflicting trade interests and railway interests at work; and there are the strong interests of honest ignorance and dishonesty ingenuity. What can these men mean, who are no fools? 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 full 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 the 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 favor 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 favorite motto is—

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

That is the paraphrase of the Monroe doctrine. And the popular voice has favored—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, and yet for three centuries—from CHARLES V. to NAPOLEON—our fathers combatted to the death against the subjection 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 mind of the thoughtful men who followed the standard of the third WILLIAM in Europe, 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 favorable 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 sorrry 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 honorable 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 thinks first of 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 those—"GOD hath made of one blood all the 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, organized themselves into a Church, and in the following year secured the services of the Rev. JOHN YOUNG. At this time they met in the Recollet 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 Recollet Fathers, presenting them with "One box of candles, 56lbs., at 8d., and one hogshead of Spanish wine at £6 5s."

(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 Recollet 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—(great laughter)—and here, on the other hand, are the grateful Presbyterians presenting to these same Seminary priests wine and wax tapers in acknowledgment of the use of their church, for Presbyterian service. Certainly a more characteristic instance of true 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 civilization 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 did so because it granted all the petitioners asked, and I think 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 magistrates 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 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—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 burn yet 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 pretext or for a principle? 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 pretty plain he did not simply borrow the argument for use the the other night, when he was 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 are 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, and this opinion was 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 favorable 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 Goverment. It is a principle coincident with 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 Confederation, and the old French Dukedoms were confederated in the States General. It is a principle that runs through all the history of civilization 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 force was so inadequate to the exposition of these 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 honor, we are bound in good faith, to four provinces occupied by our fellow-colonists, to carry out the measure 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 arbitrar of us all, in our true Federal metropolis—we go there to ask for our fundamental Charter. We hope, by having that Charter that 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 any free government, are liberty and permanency. We have had liberty enough—too much perhaps in some respects—but at all events, liberty to our heart's 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, 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 recognised constitutional organs. We need in these provinces-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 characterizes this democratic age, is a sufficient guarantee for amendment. That 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 furthest; 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 pretension 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 only true 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 endeavor 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 scarcely see on the map have grown into great communities. A great danger has arisen in our near neighborhood. 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, what we can do, we will do cheerfully and loyally. But we want time to grow—we want more people to fill our country, more industrious families of men to develope 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 fulfil it 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.)