

objection raised by my hon. friend from Niagara (Hon. Mr. CURRIE). He has found it convenient to pass them all over for the simple reason that he found them unanswerable. My hon. friend says:—"Was not the French language restored to Lower Canada, and was not this a change in the Constitution?"

Hon. gentlemen, it was certainly restored, and by the Conservative administration of that day, and, as my hon. friend opposite (Hon. Mr. BOULTON) has said, unanimously. There was no opposition, for it was considered a right to which our French Canadian fellow-subjects were fully entitled. But is the restoration of the French language to be compared with the resolutions now proposed—with the great constitutional change which is intended to affect, not only ourselves, but our children and our children's children for all time to come? Is a change like this to be compared with the restoration of the French language? Certainly not. It seems to me to be the most extraordinary comparison I ever heard of. Then my hon. friend has referred to the change in the constitution of the Legislative Council. But was not that question over and over again before the people? Did not the people at the hustings frequently pronounce an opinion upon that change? Undoubtedly they did, and it being understood that the people were in favor of it, the change was brought about. My hon. friend says that in the Conference they were surrounded with difficulties. No doubt they were. And why? Because they allowed for Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland as many delegates as they did for Canada. No doubt they were surrounded with difficulties. No doubt they were overwhelmed by the demands of these gentlemen. The hon. gentleman says that Confederation is necessary to strengthen the defences of the country. In what way? Can any hon. gentleman tell me in what way? I have not heard one word to prove, to my satisfaction, how the defences of the country are to be strengthened by Federation, unless indeed it be by placing the whole of the provinces under one head. Why, hon. gentlemen, did I not shew here the other day what was the feeling of the Lower Provinces in regard to the defences of the country? At a time when our Parliament were proposing to pass an act which would entail the expenditure of millions on the defences of the country, what was being done in the Lower Provinces? Why the Financial Secre-

tary of one of the provinces came down with a proposed grant of \$20,000, and he was obliged to apologize to the House that the sum was so large! And the present Premier of Nova Scotia—the provinces second in importance in British North America—proposed to strike off \$12,000, and leave the appropriation at \$8,000. This was proposed by a province next in importance to our own, and at the time of the *Trent* affair, when there was an appearance of danger much greater than at present. And what did New Brunswick do? Appropriate \$15,000. The people that did all this are the people to whom we are to ally ourselves that we may be strengthened in our efforts for the defence of the country! Do hon. gentlemen believe that an alliance with provinces whose leading men hold such views as these would add to our strength? Certainly not. My hon. friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands has also said that 95 out of every 100 of the people of Upper Canada are in favor of Federation. My hon. friend is mistaken. I once had the honor of representing a portion of his constituents, and I would inform my hon. friend that I know as much of the feeling, not simply of the people of Upper Canada, speaking of them generally, but of his constituents, as he does; and this I would say that were my hon. friend to go before his constituents and tell them that, in order to get Federation, Upper Canada is to pay two-thirds of the cost of the Intercolonial Railway, and two-thirds of the cost of maintenance of the road for all time to come, and that the roads of the Lower Provinces are to be made Government roads, and to be kept up in future at the expense of the Federal Government, and that Upper Canada will have two-thirds of the burden to bear, I will venture to say that my hon. friend would find himself wrong in his estimate of being able to satisfy 95 out of every 100 of his constituents.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Tell them of all the circumstances, and I would be able to satisfy them.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—My hon. friend is greatly mistaken. If my hon. friend is to be one of the life members under the Federation, he would not require so much to satisfy them.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend is altogether too fast. I do not look forward to any such thing.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—My hon. friend has the power in his hands; but if he does