

HON. MR. DORION—MR. SPEAKER, the intelligence received from New Brunswick since the last sitting has caused the question of Confederation, now under discussion, to lose much of its interest. Every one is now convinced that it is a question which no longer has any real existence, and which may safely be shelved for some time to come at all events. I deem it, however, to be my duty to make a few observations in reply to the hon. member for Montmorency, and to allude in passing to the speech of the Hon. Solicitor General East (Honorable Mr. LANGEVIN). The honorable member for Montmorency began his speech by saying that the members of this House ought to raise their views above all paltry considerations of a personal or party character, and discuss the question of Confederation upon its own merits, that thereby its advantages or disadvantages might be made apparent. And yet the honorable member has devoted at least one-third of his speech to calling to mind and discussing what I may or may not have said in past times. I have already said, and I repeat it, that I defy any member of this House to cite a single passage from any one of my speeches, or one single line of anything I may have ever written, to prove that I have ever been in favor of a Confederation of the British North American Provinces. In order to produce a semblance of proof, and with the view of making me contradict myself, it has been necessary to torture my words, to falsify my speeches, to make false translations of them; and even then with all the skill that has been used, the attempt has been unsuccessful. The speech which has been quoted with the greatest complacency, to shew that I was in favor of the Confederation of all the provinces, is that which I delivered on the 3rd May, 1860. This speech, which occupied nearly two hours in its delivery, was reported in about twenty-five lines of the *Morning Chronicle*, and only occupied a column in the *Mirror of Parliament*. These two reports are completely at variance one with the other, and neither of them is exact; but they are sufficient, nevertheless, to establish the contrary of what it has been tried to prove. When it was desired to shew that I was in favor of representation based upon population, a part of the report in the *Mirror* has been cited, and when it is sought to establish that I was in favor of Confederation, the report of the *Chronicle*

is triumphantly brought forward. But the portion of the *Mirror* report, which is cited in relation to representation, is so absurd that it suffices to read it to be convinced that I could never have made use of the expressions which it contains. For instance, on the occasion of a discussion which has but an incidental relation to representation based on population, but which relates to a Confederation of the two provinces, I am made to say that I have always been opposed to representation by population, but that if Upper Canada desired to have it, that I was ready to concede it. This is nearly the contrary of what I said on that occasion, for I invariably make my speeches coincide with my votes; and as I have invariably voted against every proposition tending to the concession of representation based upon population, so I have never declared that I was in favor of that measure, but on the contrary, I have always declared that Lower Canada could never consent to such a proposition, because it offered no guarantee for her institutions. (Hear, hear.) But now that the question of Confederation is under discussion, the *Mirror* report is set aside and that of the *Chronicle* is quoted. This report made me say, in substance, that I looked upon the Federal union of Upper and Lower Canada as the nucleus of the great Confederation of the British North American Provinces, that every one foresaw must sooner or later be effected. The expression used in the report is "to which all looked forward." The hon. member for Montmorency, who has brought this report to light, although he could not be ignorant that an entirely different one was contained in the *Mirror of Parliament*, has given the text of it by substituting the word "he" for the word "all," and has translated it so as to make me say, in speaking of the Confederation of all the provinces, "*que je l'appelais de tous mes vœux*," and in translating this last expression into English, in the pamphlet written by him in 1865, he makes me say, "which (Confederation) I strongly desire to see." It is enough to read the report in the *Mirror*, imperfect though it be, to shew that I never said anything of the kind. This is what I said in speaking of Confederation:—

He urged that the principle of the double majority could only be applied by giving to each section of the province the control of its local affairs, and that when populations differed so