

better known. Does not the best understanding exist between the people of different origins in all classes of society? We every day perceive with pleasure, and I am happy to say it, that Lower Canada has risen greatly in the estimation of hon. members from Upper Canada, since it has been their lot to reside in our midst, and to see for themselves what our institutions are, and what we are ourselves. (Hear.) I hope that my honorable friend the member for Lotbinière will forgive me if I take the liberty of discussing, for a few seconds longer, certain portions of his speech; but I am very anxious to convince him that I listened to him with great attention, and that if he did not succeed in convincing me, it was from no fault of mine. To set us on our guard against the proposed union, the hon. member laid before us a hasty sketch of the history of Ancient Greece, in order to shew us the hatred which the Athenians bore to the Spartans. No doubt he fears that that hatred, should the union be consummated, will manifest itself between the inhabitants of Lower Canada and the inhabitants of Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island. He also took us a long journey through various countries, in which he pointed out to us frequent insurrections, *échauffurées* and troubles of all kinds among people living under a system of Federal union, and therefrom he drew the conclusion that Federal unions are bad and pernicious. But did the honorable member shew us that the political condition of those nations, previous to their Federative union, was analogous to ours? Did he shew us that the basis of those Federal unions was similar to the basis of that which we propose to establish? Did those unions cause those nations to pass from a state of prosperity, tranquillity, and happiness, to the state in which they have been held up to our view? Were they situated as we are? Had they the same proclivities, the same tastes, and the same antecedents as we have? Did they, as we do, trace their descent from the two wisest, the two greatest nations in the world? Lastly, had they, as we have, the Crown of England to protect them? No! they were not possessed of any of the advantages of which we are possessed, and no comparison between the two cases was possible. (Hear hear.) Besides, Mr. SPEAKER, is it not sufficient to cast a glance at the history of all countries, to perceive that everywhere, under all possible institutions, there have arisen, not

only *échauffurées*, but even frequent wars and sanguinary revolutions, characterized by the greatest horrors? Have not the institutions of England and France been consecrated in rivers of blood? All these arguments and reasonings adduced by the honorable member for Lotbinière are therefore not applicable to the question which is submitted to us, and are not of a nature to change the opinions of those who are in favor of a Federal union of all the British North American Provinces. (Hear, hear.) I now return to certain objections offered by other honorable members of the Opposition to the present scheme of the Government. Thus, they spoke to us of divorce, and tried to show us that great inconvenience would result from leaving to the Federal Parliament the right of legislating on that subject. But they do not remark that by this means the members from Lower Canada, that is to say, in the Local Legislature, will be exonerated from taking those questions into consideration. At the present day, all the Catholic members from Lower Canada are opposed to divorce as a matter of expediency and of conscience, and yet, even in the existing Legislature, they cannot prevent it. Why, therefore, blame the Government for not having prevented in the Federal Parliament that which they cannot even prevent here?

HON. MR. LAFRAMBOISE—They could prevent divorces in Lower Canada.

MR. RÉMILLARD—Has it ever been very easy to impose in Lower Canada laws upon the English inhabitants of that province, and to prevent them from obtaining what they consider as a right? No; it would have been an act of injustice to endeavor to force our opinions on this subject on the English and Protestant population of Lower Canada; and if an attempt had been made to do so, Confederation would probably have failed, because the majority of the members of the Conference would have maintained their claims, and this would have been sufficient to prevent Confederation. (Hear, hear.) It is not to be urged as a crime against the Government that they have permitted the Federal Legislature to have the power of legislating upon subjects upon which we ourselves may legislate. For my part, Mr. SPEAKER, I did not enter upon this question in order to judge the scheme of Confederation. I have sufficient confidence in the clergy to admit that on this question they