

I am quite sure that the almost forgotten publication in which it appeared was never known, even by name, to the illustrious person who delivered the speech on that occasion. But I will own when I saw my bantling held up to the admiration of the House in the delicate and fostering hands of the hon. member for Hochelaga, I was not ashamed of it; on the contrary, perhaps there was some tingling of parental pride when I saw what ten years ago I pointed out as the true position for these colonies to take, about to be adopted by all the colonies under such favorable circumstances. I do not think it ought to be made a matter of reproach to me, or a cause for belittling the importance of the subject, that ten years ago I used the identical phrase employed in the Speech from the Throne. The idea itself is a good one, and it may have floated through the minds of many men and received intellectual hospitality even from the honorable member for Hochelaga himself. One is reminded by this sort of thing, of Puff in the *Critic*. "Two people" happened "to hit upon the same thought, and SHAKSPEARE made use of it first—that's all." (Laughter.) My honorable friend is in this respect, no doubt, the SHAKSPEARE of the new nationality. (Renewed laughter.) If there is anything in the article he has read to the House which is deserving of disapprobation, he is *particeps criminis*, and equally blameable if not more blameable than myself. He is indeed the older sinner, and I bow to him in that character with all proper humility. (Renewed laughter.) Really, Mr. SPEAKER, the attempt to fix the parentage of this child of many fathers is altogether absurd and futile. It is almost as ridiculous as the attempt to fix the name of this new Confederation, in advance of the decision of the Gracious Lady to whom the matter is to be referred. I have read in one newspaper published in a western city not less than a dozen attempts of this nature. One individual chooses Tuponia and another Hochelaga, as a suitable name for the new nationality. Now I would ask any hon. member of this House how he would feel if he woke up some fine morning and found himself, instead of a Canadian, a Tuponian or Hochelagander. (Laughter.) I think, sir, we may safely leave for the present the discussion of the name as well as the origin of the new system proposed; when the Confederation has a place among the nations of the world, and opens a new page in history, it will be

time enough to look into its antecedents, and when it has reached this stage there are a few men who, having struggled for it in its earlier difficulties, will then deserve to be honorably mentioned. I shall not be guilty of the bad taste of complimenting those with whom I have the honor to be associated; but when we reach the stage of research, which lies far beyond the stage of deliberation in these affairs, there are some names that ought not to be forgotten. (Hear, hear.) So far back as the year 1800, the Honorable Mr. UNIAOKE, a leading politician in Nova Scotia at that date, submitted a scheme of Colonial Union to the Imperial authorities. In 1815, Chief Justice SEWELL, whose name will be well remembered as a leading lawyer of this city and a far-sighted politician, submitted a scheme. In 1822, Sir JOHN BEVERLEY ROBINSON, at the request of the Colonial Office, submitted a project of the same kind; and I need not refer to the report of Lord DURHAM on Colonial Union in 1839. These are all memorable, and some of them are great names. If we have dreamed a dream of union (as some hon. gentlemen say), it is at least worth while remarking that a dream which has been dreamed by such wise and good men, may, for aught we know or you know, have been a sort of vision—a vision foreshadowing forthcoming natural events in a clear intelligence. A vision (I say it without irreverence, for the event concerns the lives of millions living, and yet to come) resembling those seen by the DANIELS and JOSEPHS of old, foreshadowing the trials of the future; the fate of tribes and peoples; the rise and fall of dynasties. But the immediate history of the measure is sufficiently wonderful without dwelling on the remoter predictions of so many wise men. Whoever, in 1862, or even in 1863, would have told us that we should see, even what we see in these seats by which I stand—such a representation of interests acting together, would be accounted, as our Scotch friends say, "half-daft;"—and whoever, in the Lower Provinces about the same time, would have ventured to foretell the composition of their delegations, which sat with us under this roof last October, would probably have been considered equally demented. (Laughter.) But the thing came about, and if those gentlemen, who have had no immediate hand in bringing it about, and therefore naturally felt less interest in the project than we who did, will only give us the