

contrary to all precedent, union is not strength. (Hear, hear.) But I will state why this union is calculated to prolong our connection with Britain. It is well known that there has been an entire and radical change of late in the colonial policy of England. That policy has been to extend to us the utmost liberty in our relations to the Empire. What is after all the nature of the bond which links us to Great Britain, apart from our allegiance and loyalty? What is it but a Federative bond? That is what links us to Britain, and I feel quite satisfied, in the words of an English publicist of some eminence, that "the new colonial policy is calculated to prolong the connection of the colonies with the Mother Country." I believe it will raise these provinces as part of the British Empire, and so secure to us the permanency of British institutions, and bind us more closely to the Crown. (Hear, hear.) I believe it will, in the words of that far-seeing statesman, Lord DURHAM, "raise up to the North American colonist a nationality of his own by elevating those small and unimportant communities into a society having some objects of national importance, and give these inhabitants a country which they will be unwilling to see absorbed into that of their powerful neighbors." And, sir, our neighbors so see it. Shortly after the visit of the Duke of NEWCASTLE to this country, attention was directed to the question of the union of the colonies, not only in this country, but in England and in the United States. The *New York Courier and Inquirer*, in an article published at that time, came to the conclusion "that the union would, in fact, be an argument for a continuance of the existing relations between the two countries as a matter of policy and gratitude, and that such a change of government could be met with no objection of any weight." (Hear, hear.) I invite the attention of the honorable member for Chateaugay to that statement. But, Mr. SPEAKER, it is a singular study, looking back over the history of the past, to see how this question has come up in the experience of the various colonies. Before the American revolution, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN suggested a plan for a Federation of the old colonies of Britain on this continent, which, he afterwards said, would, according to his deliberate opinion, have prevented the severance of the connection between the colonies and the Mother Country. I will quote a passage written by him after the revolution, in which he makes allusion to this project. He said:—

I proposed and drew up a plan for the union of

all the colonies under one government, so far as might be necessary for defence and other important general purposes. By my plan, the General Government was to be administered by a President-General, appointed and supported by the Crown, and a General Council, to be chosen by the representatives of the people of the several colonies, met in the respective assemblies. The plan was agreed to in Congress, but the assemblies of the provinces did not adopt it, as they thought there was too much prerogative in it, and in England it was judged to have too much of the democratic. The different and contrary reasons of dislike to my plan made me suspect that it was really the true medium, and I am still of opinion it would have been happy for both sides if it had been adopted. The colonies so united would have been strong enough to have defended themselves; there would then have been no need of troops from England; of course the subsequent pretext for taxing America, and also the bloody contest it occasioned, would have been avoided.

It is singular that nearly a hundred years ago, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, looking at the difficulties then existing between the colonies, should have suggested a plan of union similar to that now proposed to us, and it is a strong proof of the wisdom of the plan now before this House, that seeing the difficulties under which the other colonies labored for want of a central power, just as we now see them, proposing this Confederation, he should have declared that if such a plan had been adopted then it would have prevented the severance of the British connection.

HON. MR. HOLTON—This scheme is looked upon as equal to independence.

MR. MORRIS—Is that the opinion of the honorable member? I think that far different views prevail in Britain. In 1858, when British Columbia was erected into a colony, it was found then that the Commons of Britain had no intention of surrendering the fair possessions of Britain on this continent, and Her Majesty was advised to say:—

Her Majesty hopes that the new colony in the Pacific may be but one step in the career of steady progress, by which Her Majesty's dominions in North America may ultimately be peopled in an unbroken chain from the Atlantic to the Pacific by a loyal, industrious population of subjects of the British Crown.

(Hear, hear.) I say, sir, that there is no evidence whatever that the statesmen of Britain look upon this great scheme as involving the severance of our connection with the Empire; but these utterances, as read here the other night by the honorable member from Montreal Centre, prove directly the contrary. If breaking off from the Mother