

be done, it would no doubt be agreeable to the people of Upper Canada, because we think that in our Common School system there should be no element of sectarianism. As a people, we are desirous of having our School law without any provision for separate schools. It is perhaps a bold statement to make, but I believe the people of Upper Canada as a whole, Roman Catholics as well as Protestants, would be content with our school system without a particle of sectarianism in it. We could scarcely expect that if we were to succeed in framing a basis of union under a new Constitution, we could get the sectarian clauses of the School Act removed, if they were insisted upon as *sine qua non* by the Roman Catholics in Lower Canada in conjunction with the adherents of the same faith in Upper Canada. But notwithstanding this, although it is a sensitive point in Upper Canada, and particularly among my own constituents, I venture to say that the people of the west generally, in their willingness at all times to listen to reason, will be quite content to accept the scheme as a whole, as it has been presented to us. (Hear, hear.) I hope that no attempt will be made to increase the privileges of the advocates of separate schools, but that the question will be left where we now find it. (Hear, hear.) It is worth while, perhaps, to read a single passage, written by a distinguished man, in reference to this principle of concession. I have already instanced the views of the framers of the American Constitution when they set to work to do away with the first Federation scheme and to adopt a new Constitution. When they had framed the new Constitution, we find WASHINGTON accompanying the document with a letter, in which this passage occurs :—

It is obviously impracticable in the Federal Government of these states to secure all rights of independent sovereignty to each, and yet provide for the interest and safety of all. Individuals entering into society must give up a share of liberty to preserve the rest. The magnitude of the sacrifice must depend as well on situation and circumstances as on the object to be attained. It is at all times difficult to draw with precision the line between those rights which *must be surrendered* and those which *may be reserved*.

Doubtless, sir, the members of the Quebec Conference encountered the same difficulties as the framers of the American Constitution did. They must have found it difficult to

draw the line exactly where it should be drawn. I presume it could not be done, and that each one felt it incumbent upon him to make certain concessions, and that all they could hope to do was to have some broad margin, some neutral ground, on which to draw the line, so as to be able to say they did the best they could to unite the sectional interests of the provinces and to further something like a nationality for the country. (Hear, hear.) I do not desire to trespass upon the House; I have purposely passed over much that I intended to have said, had the Government desired to encourage discussion at greater length; and I pass on rapidly to a conclusion. (Cries of "Go on!") I think the union desirable, not only as a benefit to ourselves, but as a means for consolidating the British Empire on this continent, and to save us from a degrading dependency on the United States, especially as we have the means within ourselves of making them to a certain extent dependent upon us. Look at the map of this country, look at the position we occupy geographically; see the outlet we possess to the ocean; look at the magnificent St. Lawrence, with the vast grain growing country beyond it. Is it not in our power to draw the trade of the Great West through this its natural outlet to the ocean? Is it not possible to so improve this channel as to bring the produce of the great Western States to market through our territory? Is it not possible, by means of a little judicious outlay, to make the people of the United States dependent on us, instead of us being dependent on them? (Hear, hear.) There is much that could be said on this subject, and the means that might be resorted to for securing to us these benefits of trade and commerce. It is not so much to the enlargement of the Welland and St. Lawrence canals, although that is necessary, as to the construction of a ship canal to Lake Huron through the Ottawa country, that in my opinion we must look for the ultimate commercial greatness of this country, as furnishing the shortest and safest route for the conveyance of the contents of the great granaries of the west to foreign markets. The proposed Ottawa canal may not run through a country as fertile as the valley of the St. Lawrence; it is of a different geological formation; nevertheless, I believe it to be a country of great riches, whose resources are as yet undeveloped. I think that