

gentleman will permit me, I may say that I followed the honorable member for Brome very closely, and that according to my understanding he expressed himself in favor of Federation, but without a union such as that now proposed. His argument was that we should federate with the Imperial Government, and that there should be a Council in London.

HON. MR. HOLTON—That was another point.

HON. MR. MCGEE—No, it was this point: His proposal was—and he is the only member on the other side who has ventured to put forth a counter-proposition to that now before the House—that we should have a Council similar to that for the East Indies. I intend to reply to this proposition when the proper time comes. But my honorable friend from Peterborough is quite right in what he has stated.

COL. HAULTAIN—I am of opinion that the honorable member for Brome, if he did not desire it at the present time, at any rate expressed himself in favor of union at some future time.

HON. MR. HOLTON—A legislative union, if a union at all. But he really did not want any other than that now existing.

COL. HAULTAIN—That is precisely what I said, and I maintain that the very same arguments which I have alluded to as used against a Federal union, might likewise be urged against a Legislative union—that there would be the same amount of “log-rolling” in the latter as in the former.

HON. MR. BROWN—And a great deal more.

COL. HAULTAIN—Certainly as much. I think my honorable friend from North Ontario (Mr. M. C. CAMERON) used the same argument, and yet I believe he is in favor of a legislative union.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I am.

COL. HAULTAIN—But my honorable friend must see that this argument against the Federal union might be urged with equal cogency against any union at all.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I may, perhaps, be allowed to say that my position is just this, that a legislative union would be preferable, because the people would enter into it with the design of working for the harmony and advantage of the people; whereas, if a Federal union were entered into, the local interests of each province would predominate over the interests of the whole.

COL. HAULTAIN—I think in this point of view the argument is rather in favor of

the Federal principle, which does remove some of the causes of the difficulty, in so far as local matters are removed from the jurisdiction of the General Government, and are left to that of the local governments. But looking at it in every point of view; considering the greater expense, the danger of collision between the governments, and the comparative division of sovereignty under the Federal system, I am decidedly in favor of the closer and more simple form of government secured by a legislative union. (Hear, hear.) But I would remark to those who oppose the former because of their professed desire to see the adoption of the latter, that in attacking the Federal scheme in the manner alluded to, they are only putting arguments into the mouths of those who are opposed to any union at all. They should also take into consideration, that it is admitted on all sides that a legislative union is unattainable, and therefore, practically, we need not now discuss their comparative merits. It appears to me but a useless waste of time to advocate a certain system of union with others, and to make such advocacy the ground for opposing a practicable union, when those with whom we are to unite, and who are free to make their own choice, pronounce against it. (Hear.) We have to consult the wishes of six independent provinces; and if five of them oppose a legislative union, what sense or justice is there in making our preference for it an argument against the only union that all will consent to, unless indeed it is urged that no union is better than a Federal one. In again referring to the remarks of the honorable member for Brome, I feel bound to say that I listened with great pleasure to the microscopic analysis to which he subjected the proposed scheme. He was, however, only satisfied with picturing all the possible dangers to which we might be exposed in the working of it. He dwelt with a certain kind of satisfaction on the succession of knaves and fools to whom might be committed our future destiny under it; the possibility that its very adoption would call into existence a race of public men devoid of all moral worth and ordinary intelligence. But, sir, I wish to take a practical, common sense view of this question, and I think the country will be inclined to do the same. Were a similar dissection made of the provisions or institutions regulating human society in any of its diversified combinations, dangers and difficulties might be magnified, and all patriotism, virtue and justice consigned to the grave of the past; this would apply