

33rd sub-section gives to the General Government the power of "rendering uniform all or any of the laws relative to property and civil rights in Upper Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island, and rendering uniform the procedure of all or any of the courts in these provinces; but any statute for this purpose shall have no force or authority in any province until sanctioned by the legislature thereof." So that in reality no such law will be binding until it has the sanction of the Local Legislature of the province particularly affected thereby. Such being the guarded terms of the resolution, why is it not made applicable to Lower Canada as well as to the other provinces? Nothing could be done respecting its peculiar laws without the consent of its Local Legislature, and it is quite possible to my mind, that there are some laws which it would be advantageous to all parts of the Confederation to assimilate. But they emphatically declare in these resolutions that there shall be no interference with the laws of Lower Canada. So that while it is proposed to assimilate the laws of the other provinces, there is a large section of intervening country which is to have, for all time to come, laws separate and distinct from the rest. (Hear, hear.) There is a great deal of difference in making a provision of this kind, which is to give the people the option, and which is not to be binding for all time to come unless sanctioned by them, and declaring that a law shall be forced upon the people whether they liked it or not. (Hear.) I can easily understand the feeling of the French people, and can admire it—that they do not want to have anything forced upon them whether they will or not. But that they will not allow you to contemplate even the possibility of any change taking place for the general weal, and with their own consent, in their laws—that they will not allow anything to be introduced into this measure by which, under any circumstances whatever, we can meddle with the laws of this particular section of the country—I do not understand. And having feelings of this kind, and manifesting them so strongly as they do in this document, it appears to me that in going into this union, we do not go into it with the proper elements. We go into it with elements of strife and dissension, rather than of union and strength. (Hear, hear.) That is to be regretted; for if a change is to be made affecting the destinies of the people of this country, it is lamentable that we do

not find patriotism enough among the representatives of the people to be willing to give and take, so that we may have such a union as will be beneficial to the whole, and not one burdensome to the whole, because one portion of the country says, "We have peculiar institutions which we dare not entrust to the care of you, gentlemen, who are to be united with us." Having given this whole matter the best attention I could, with the most earnest desire that any man could have to come to a just conclusion, I have not been able to satisfy myself that there are not the elements of ruin rather than of safety and strength in this scheme; that there are not the elements of the dismemberment of this country from the Empire to which we belong, and have pride in belonging; that there is not the means here of causing us to drift right into the vortex of annexation to the United States, whether we will or not. So far as I am concerned, I should sooner see perish root and branch everything belonging to me, than I would become a party to a union with that power. Feeling no hostility to the people there—feeling as friendly to them as to any other people, still I have that attachment to British institutions—I have within me that feeling of allegiance to the British Crown, which would not allow me to throw off British connection under any circumstances whatever, or even to accept the disruption of that connection, if it were offered to us by Great Britain. I feel it would be a curse to this country, if we were forced into that union—forced to adopt the licentiousness of conduct which we find there, and habits and manners totally distasteful to us. To be brought into that union would seem to me the greatest injury which by possibility could happen to us. In adopting the scheme before us, I feel we would be sowing the seeds of discord and strife, which would destroy our union, instead of its being cemented by this measure. I am therefore opposed to the scheme, because I believe that politically, commercially, and defensively, as a matter of economy or of sectional benefit, it will not be one tittle of service to this country, but on the contrary will inflict on it a vast and lasting injury. (Cheers.)

MR. DUNKIN said he desired to take part in the debate, but did not wish to commence at this late hour, and if no other honorable gentleman was disposed to speak, he would move that the debate be adjourned.