

manifesting a desire for the maintenance of the connection.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—What does the concluding part of the article say?

COL. HAULTAIN—That a stronger alliance is desired.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I mean the concluding part of the article altogether.

COL. HAULTAIN—I do not mean to say that there is nothing in the latter part which contradicts the former. But the article points to a position the writer would desire to see us occupy.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—A position of independence.

COL. HAULTAIN—Of alliance, not independence.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—No; the latter part of the article expresses the satisfaction felt by the writer at the prospect of our becoming independent.

COL. HAULTAIN—I have not the *Review* by me, and it may be as my honorable friend says. But the general drift of the article is as I have stated it to be. I do not mean to say that there are not apparently contradictory sentiments therein expressed—sentiments which are absolutely and altogether contradictory. To resume my argument, it seems to me that if we evinced a desire to remove the existing causes of complaint, even the Manchester School, even such men as GOLDWIN SMITH, would not be unwilling to see the connection between these provinces and the Mother Country continue. My honorable friend the member for Brome, not only alluded to this article in the *Edinburgh Review*, but he thought there were speeches uttered by certain noblemen and gentlemen in their places in the British Parliament, from which, looking at them through his discolored lens, he could extract sentiments of a similar character. The hon. gentleman would admit nothing whatever in favor of this scheme, and seemed determined that England, whether she liked it or not, should cut the connection. He said the Mother Country eulogised the scheme, but—that Lord GRANVILLE approved, but—that Lord DERBY spoke in favor of the connection, but—All the virtue to his mind was in the “buts.” Nothing would satisfy him, and nothing would satisfy England whatever was done, and the sooner she got rid of us as a bad bargain, the better she would be pleased. (Laughter.) But what was really the tone of the speeches from which the hon. gentleman quoted? Lord HOUGHTON,

in seconding the motion for the Address in the House of Lords, on the 7th of February, said, “He hoped and believed that these colonies would still recognize the value of the British connection, and that their amalgamation would render them more safe, without in any way weakening their fealty. (Cheers.)” What language, I ask, could more clearly express the feelings of the person speaking than this, and, as the seconder of the Address, the desire also of the party connected with him, that “our fealty to the British Crown should in no manner be weakened.” And yet my honorable friend from Brome thought, with that discolored view he took of it, that he detected some uncertainty—some “but.” (Laughter.) Lord DERBY was even more strong and emphatic in his language:—

If I saw in this Confederation a desire to separate from this country, I should consider that a matter of so much more doubtful policy; but I see it with satisfaction—perhaps, however, it is too soon to discuss resolutions which have not yet been finally adopted—but I hope I see, in the terms of this proposed Confederation, an earnest desire to retain the blessings of the connection with this country—an earnest feeling of loyalty, and a determined and deliberate preference for a monarchical form of government over republican institutions, and a desire to maintain, as long as it can be maintained peaceably—and no human being can wish to see it maintained longer—the amicable connection which at present exists between this country and the colonies. (Cheers.)

I notice that on both occasions when Lord DERBY and Lord HOUGHTON expressed these sentiments of attachment to the colonies, cheers were given in the House of Lords; and yet the hon. member for Brome, laboring under some extraordinary mental hallucination—(laughter)—thought he could detect evidences of a desire to abandon us to our fate—a willingness on the part of the two great parties represented in the House of Lords by Earl GRANVILLE and Earl DERBY, that this connection should cease! When we consider the position Lord DERBY occupies; when we consider that he spoke from his seat in Parliament—and we all know the significance attached to the utterances of even the men of least note, when they speak from their places in the Legislature, how their words will be noted down and become a matter of record to be referred to five or ten years hence perhaps, as I dare say has more than once been found to be the case with regard to honorable gentlemen