

given to this proposition of Federation (and her statesmen see in this a great source of strength in enabling her to avert a war, and a ready means of defending the country)—do you believe that those statesmen will look kindly upon the act? Even my honorable friend from Hochelaga has admitted that there must be in that case a dissolution of the union between Upper and Lower Canada. That honorable gentleman stated in his speech the other night, that if this measure failed there must be Federation between the Canadas; and what, I would ask, is that but a dissolution of the present union? It is certainly a dissolution of the present union to adopt some new Federative system as between Upper and Lower Canada. But does the honorable gentleman think that he will find in the separation of these provinces an element of strength?

HON. MR. HOLTON—That is what you propose to do now.

HON. MR. ROSE—No, Mr. SPEAKER, I do not propose to do anything of the kind, as my honorable friend will acknowledge, if he will but bring his mind, dispassionately and earnestly, to the consideration of the question. There is no one more capable of seeing and appreciating the important features of this scheme than he. But my hon. friend has strong feelings, and sometimes is led away by preconceived jealousies or fears; I say that if my honorable friend will bring his strong intellect to bear on this scheme, he will find in it none of those dangers which ordinarily attach to the Federal form of government. I must now say a few more words in reference to the question of our ability to provide for the defences of the country. I have already stated—and I must apologise to the House for the digression which has been forced upon me—that I do not believe that, if we reverted back to our original condition, the Imperial Government would be as much disposed to aid us in the construction of the works necessary for our defence, as if they found that in the presence of a common danger we were united together to repel the common enemy. I say the Imperial Government would not in such a case be actuated simply by a regard to the expense of constructing these works—in which I understand the Lower Provinces will have to bear a share—but she would be deterred from so doing by the further consideration, that when built, these works would be less likely to serve the purpose they were designed to, accomplish, namely,

to enable the country to be efficiently defended. It is one thing to have a population of four millions united under one common head, and enabled to direct all their energies to the point of danger; and it is another thing to have a number of separate units, with no common action—each under a different government, and distracted and separate at the very time when they ought to be most united. (Hear, hear.) What we have to guard against is this: a sudden conquest or surprise, for which we might be unprepared. I believe myself that, if works can be constructed, by means of which we can effectually defend the country against sudden attack, no one will grudge the expense. Of course they will cost no inconsiderable sum; but I hope, as I believe my hon. friend the Finance Minister, although he may be pressed for other purposes, will not hesitate to recommend the appropriation necessary for the purpose, and to impose increased taxation for that purpose. (Hear, hear.) For I am sure that no member of this house, nor man in this country, would hesitate, if need were, to put their hands in their pockets and give a tenth of their substance for the construction of the works required to protect the country from the ravages of the aggressor, and to secure to ourselves a perpetuation of the inestimable blessings derived from our living under the British flag. (Hear, hear.) I am the more earnest in this question on account of the observations which have been made by my honorable friend the member for Hochelaga, (Hon. Mr. DORION) observations which I am sure he did not mean to have such an effect, but which nevertheless have a most mischievous tendency. That hon. gentleman stated that our true policy was, in fact, neutrality; that it was hopeless for us to attempt to defend ourselves against the overwhelming force which the United States could bring to bear against us, and that with our small population we would be very much in the same position as Denmark when opposed to the armies of Austria and Prussia. Indeed, he almost went as far as a gentleman who no longer holds a seat in this House, when he said that “the best armament for Canada was no armament at all.” I am sure that had the honorable gentleman felt that any injury would be done—any false impression produced on the public mind—by the use of observations like these, he would not have employed them at all. But I may say that they all tended to this end—the taking away