

ence, and finally the plan of Confederation, although he does not now choose to acknowledge his offspring. (Hear, hear.) That conduct releases the latter from any debt of gratitude. (Hear.) It is not my intention to discuss the question of Confederation in a commercial point of view, nor in a financial point of view, nor in a political point of view, for in these several aspects it has been ably discussed by those who have preceded me. I shall confine myself to making a few remarks upon the question in respect of defence. Every one acknowledges that in order to defend a country effectually there must be unity of action, uniformity of system, and a combination of the means of defence. Without uniformity, without unity, it is impossible to make any serious attempt at defence in case of attack, and the divided country falls an easy prey to the enemy. So general is this rule that history shews us that weak nations have always united together, have always coalesced when they were attacked or were in fear of being attacked by a powerful enemy. The North American colonies did so in 1775, when they wished to offer resistance to the Mother Country. They organized themselves into a Confederation, and it was in consequence of their so doing that they were able to resist what they considered as an act of oppression on the part of England. Had those colonies, instead of organizing themselves as they did, had each of them a different system of defence, and had there been no uniformity in their tactics, England would have had an easy bargain of them. And is it to be supposed, if they had not banded themselves together, so as to possess a certain amount of strength, that they would have obtained the alliance and the assistance of France? When a feeble power is attacked by a powerful enemy, it should seek to ally itself with other states which have interests in common with it, in order that they may defend themselves in common. So far as we are concerned, if we are desirous of assisting the Mother Country in offering an effectual resistance to invasions by the American people, we ought to have unity of command, in order that we might be able to send the militia from the centre and cause them to extend towards the circumference. In case of war with our neighbors, we should, of necessity, be compelled, by the very force of circumstances, to unite with the other provinces. That being the case, why not do so at once, in time of peace, while we

have time to devote to it that calm and deliberate consideration which the importance of the subject demands. Confederation is the sole means of offering resistance to attempts at invasion by our enemies. The Federal system is the normal condition of American populations; for there are very few American nations which have not a political system of that nature. The Federal system is a state of transition which allows the different races inhabiting the same part of the globe to unite, with the view of attaining national unity and homogeneity. Spain, Belgium, France, and several other European countries were formerly peopled by different races, who constituted so many different communities; but they became united, they entered into confederations, and in the course of ages all the communities were consolidated into those which we now see—into everything that is held to be beautiful, noble and great throughout the whole world. When the Federal system has been put in practice in an enlightened manner, it has always sufficed for the requirements of those who adopted it. The case of Greece has been cited by an hon. member of this House, to show the fatal nature of this system to the nations who adopted it; but he ought to know that the decadence of Greece only began from the moment when she abandoned the Federal system. The hon. member for Lotbinière sought to prove that confederations were the source of all sorts of disturbances; and in support of what he said, he read out to us the table of contents of the history of South America, in which he found a long list of *échauffourées*, movements, agitations, risings, civil wars and revolutions. It is not my wish to deny the facts quoted by the honorable member, but I must say that his conclusions are not correct, and that it is not right to draw conclusions adverse to a system from merely perusing the table of contents of any work whatsoever. The history of all nations will afford tables of contents, which, if they were taken as indicating the normal and habitual condition of a people, would cause us to make strange mistakes and to draw strange historical conclusions. Even the present history of England, the history of the reign of Her Majesty Queen VICTORIA, might afford to a person, who was desirous of forming a judgment respecting it from the table of contents alone, some facts which might induce him to believe in the complete disorganization of