

greatest statesmen of England, whose names are identified with the history of the nation. What said Lord DERBY in reference to Confederation? Does he consider it to emanate from a mere clique of railway speculators? Speaking of the relation of Canada to the United States—and his remarks come in most opportunely in connection with the observations I made at the outset—speaking of defending the upper lakes with armed vessels, the noble lord says:—

I do not ask Her Majesty's Government what steps they have taken, but I do say this, that they will be deeply responsible if they are not fully awake to the position in which this country is placed by these two acts of the United States. If the preponderating force upon the lakes should be in the hands of the United States, it could only be used for purposes of aggression. (Hear, hear.) An attack on the part of Canada upon the United States is a physical impossibility. The long frontier of Canada is peculiarly open to aggression; and assailable as it is by land, unless there be a preponderating force upon these lakes, you must be prepared to place the province of Canada at the disposal of the United States.

I prefer the appreciation of Lord DERBY, and his opinion of the state of these affairs, to the ironical cheers or opinion of my honorable friend from Chateauguay. I place what the noble lord has said as to the Confederation question in its relation to the defence of these provinces and the strength to be thereby added to the Government of England, before anything which he or the other opponents of this scheme can express. The noble lord says with regard to the great measure itself:—

Under the circumstances I see, with additional satisfaction, the announcement of a contemplated step—I mean the proposed Federation of the British North American Provinces. I hope I may regard that Federation as a measure tending to constitute a power strong enough, with the aid of this country, which, I trust, may never be withdrawn from these provinces—to acquire an importance which separately they could not obtain. If I saw in this Federation an earnest desire to separate from this country, I should think it a matter of much more doubtful policy and advantage; but I perceive with satisfaction that no such wish is entertained. Perhaps it is premature to discuss at this moment resolutions not yet submitted to the different legislatures; but I hope I see in the terms of that Federation an earnest desire on the part of the provinces to maintain for themselves the blessing of the connection with this country, and a determined and deliberate preference for monarchical over republican institutions.

(Hear, hear, and cheers.) Now, sir, could there be anything more opportune? This is the lan-

guage of one of the ablest statesmen of England. Be united, he says, that you may be strong, and depend upon it you will have the whole power of England to sustain you. Can there be anything more cheering or encouraging to those who have taken an interest in the subject, than the language I have just quoted, and which was uttered in the House of Lords not three weeks ago? (Hear, hear.) And yet my honorable friend from Hochelaga presumes to stand up here and tell us, in effect, that we are so many children—that we are deceived with the idea that we are going to establish a great nation or Confederation of provinces, and that there is nothing of that kind in it; and he appeals to prejudices formerly entertained by members on this side of the House, in order that he may induce them to withdraw their support from the important measure which the Government has brought down, and which the greatest statesmen of England have stamped with their approval. (Hear, hear.) Perhaps the House will indulge me if I read a few more words from the discussion in the House of Lords upon the Speech from the Throne. Earl GRANVILLE, the President of the Council, said:—

And what ought to make us still more proud of the good government which must undoubtedly have prevailed amongst us, is to find that our North American colonies, in expressing their wish to continue their connexion with this country, and in adopting the new institutions they have been considering with such calm and prudent statesmanship, have thought it desirable to keep as close as possible to the constitution and institutions under which we so happily live.

(Loud cheers.) He does not belittle the men who have sacrificed so much, as honorable gentlemen opposite are inclined to do. He does not sneer at those who have gone into the matter with the honest view of carrying it out; but, on the contrary, he praises their "calm and prudent statesmanship," and says that it is a matter of which they may feel proud, and I say that those who have taken part in originating and bringing this project to the present advanced stage, may well feel proud of their work, when the greatest statesmen of the world commend it as a thing of wonderful perfection, considering the difficulties with which it is surrounded. And these opinions were not confined to any one party, but were uttered by both liberals and conservatives. Lord HOUGHTON said in the course of the same debate:—

On the other side of the Atlantic the same impulse has manifested itself in the proposed amal-