

HON. MR. CAUCHON—He was in error. That all related to the Union Act and to nothing else.

MR. PAQUET—Yes; it had reference to the beginning of the end. (Hear, hear.) A little further on I read as follows :—

A general Legislative union would elevate and gratify the hopes of able and aspiring men. They would no longer look with envy and wonder at the great arena of the bordering Federation, but see the means of satisfying every legitimate ambition in the high offices of the judicature and executive government of their own union.

Again I find the following passage :—

But even in the administration of justice, an union would immediately supply a remedy for one of the most serious wants under which the provinces labor, by facilitating the formation of a general appellate tribunal for all the North American colonies.

And again :—

The completion of any satisfactory communication between Halifax and Quebec would, in fact, produce relations between these provinces that would render a general union absolutely necessary. Several surveys have proved that a railroad would be perfectly practicable the whole way.

And thus we come to the Intercolonial Railway; and it is easy to perceive that Lord DURHAM, from the beginning to the end of his report, preaches in favor of the very Confederation which we are about to have imposed upon us. Even before Lord DURHAM, Judge SEWELL, in 1814, had expressed opinions nearly similar to those of the noble lord, and in 1839 the whole of the present plan of Confederation was traced out. The honorable member for Montmorency pretends that Lord DURHAM was mistaken; but for my part I find, in addition to the other causes of reproach which have been accumulated against the members of the Conference, we may urge this, that they did not give Lord DURHAM credit for the work he had already done, and that they did not endorse upon the scheme of Confederation now laid before us the words "True copy of the scheme of Lord DURHAM as set forth in his report to the British Government." (Hear, hear.) French-Canadian nationality has been talked about. Lord DURHAM speaks of it in his report in the following terms: "The error of Lower Canada consists especially in that vain attempt to preserve a French-Canadian nationality in the midst of Anglo-American states and colonies." When is the imposition of a new nationality

spoken of, if not at the time when it is sought to snatch from a people that which it already possesses? There will be opposition, I trust; for otherwise, Mr. SPEAKER, I cannot comprehend the logic of honorable members who emphatically declare that they will stand by it at any risk. I am well aware that the nationality of a people cannot be changed by a mere act of the Legislature; but why should obstacles be placed in our path, why should we submit to the yoke of the oppressor, when there is no legitimate ground for imposing it upon us? Another reason which gives me good ground for hoping that the work of destruction will not be accomplished in a hurry, as desired by the honorable members of the Administration, is that it is a difficult matter to ostracise a people which numbers more than a million. The example of Belgium suffices to prove it to us, and also that of Greece, which, after three centuries of tyranny and oppression, stood up manfully and exclaimed, "We are still Greeks." I am confident, then, that following their example, in defiance of all the constitutions that may be framed for us, and of all the vexations to which we may have to submit, we also shall come out triumphant from our trials, exclaiming, "We are still French-Canadians." (Hear, hear.) The honorable members of the Government, and especially those from Lower Canada, ought not to forget, either in our interest or in their own, that a generation which detaches itself from the generations which preceded it runs the risk of being repudiated by the generations which come after; that social existence is not concentrated in a single period, that it influences the future. These honorable gentlemen would do well to reflect on this before imposing upon us the practical question of Lord DURHAM. Passing now, Mr. SPEAKER, to the financial question, I regret that I cannot agree in the views expressed by the honorable member for Dorchester (the Honorable Solicitor General for Lower Canada), who claims to have expressed an official opinion on this head. Although he has affirmed that he drew them from authentic sources, the results which he has obtained from his calculations differ from those which I have obtained, founded upon the figures which he has made use of to establish his proposition. He has declared that we shall have a surplus of \$200,000.

MR. ERIC DORION—And he added that we should be in a position to lend the amount.