

in this debate have, in my opinion, said all that can be said on each of the articles. Moreover, the erudite and carefully-weighed papers on the subject which have been published in this city in the *Journal de Québec* and the *Courrier du Canada* have contributed to diffusing a knowledge of the scheme in no less degree than the numerous speeches which have been delivered in this House. Despite the good opinion which I have of some of the honorable members who have endeavored to prove to this House and to the country that the proposed union would be more disastrous than advantageous in its results to the several provinces affected by it, I must acknowledge that their arguments have not convinced me—I will even say did not appear to me to be convincing. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Lotbinière for example, in whom, as he is aware, I have confidence, and from whom I greatly regret to differ in opinion on a measure of such importance, is opposed to any alteration in our present Constitution. He finds that everything has been for the best. The following is what he said in his eloquent speech:—

Let us not be dazzled by the ambition of becoming, all at once, a great people. The United States are a great people, but what people, however small it may be, is there which now envies their greatness? Let us be satisfied with our lot; few people have a better.

I agree with my honorable friend to a certain extent. Like him, I do not envy the lot of the United States, but I disagree with him as to the means to be taken to protect us against our adversaries, even against the United States, and to preserve our nationality. The honorable member, to prove that the union proposed would be an evil, quoted to us the following extract from Lord BROUGHAM's work on *Political Philosophy*:

The Federal union, by keeping up a line of separation between its members, gives the freest scope to these pernicious prejudices, feelings which it is the highest duty of all governments to eradicate, because they lead directly to confusion and war.

I may mistake, but it appears to me that this extract from Lord BROUGHAM's work is not so much opposed to a Federal union, such as that which is proposed to us, as it is to the existing situation of the French-Canadians. In fact there is a strong line of demarcation in this province between the inhabitants of Upper Canada and those of Lower Canada; it is that very line of

demarcation which has given rise to the sectional difficulties which our statesmen have undertaken to settle in a friendly way. The leaders of the Opposition themselves undertook to settle these difficulties in a manner much less advantageous to Lower Canada. If then the opinion of Lord BROUGHAM is to be an authority in this case, it would be the duty of the Government of this province to remove the line of demarcation to which I have alluded as existing between the inhabitants of Upper Canada and those of Lower Canada. This, I am satisfied, is not what my honorable friend desires. (Hear, hear.) When speaking of the seven United Provinces (now Holland and Belgium), the hon. member for Lotbinière read the following extract from the first volume of Lord MACAULAY's *History of England*:—

The union of Utrecht, rudely formed amidst the agonies of a revolution, for the purpose of meeting immediate exigencies, had never been deliberately revised and perfected in a time of tranquillity. Every one of the seven commonwealths which that union had bound together retained almost all the rights of sovereignty, and asserted those rights punctiliously against the Central Government.

This is all that the honorable member quoted from Lord MACAULAY. As may be seen, Mr. SPEAKER, this author is not opposed to a Federal union; he simply points out the defects of the union of Utrecht. That union had been rudely formed, in the midst of a revolution, for the purpose of meeting immediate exigencies. But our plan of union was weighed with deliberation, in a time of tranquillity, and this tranquillity is certainly the result of the formation of the present Coalition Government. Therefore, the author who has been quoted merely demonstrates one thing, and that is, that we should be wrong to await the convulsions of a revolution, or of an invasion, in order to discuss the bases of a Federal union. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Lotbinière gave us to understand that the most certain method of obtaining the friendship of the Maritime Provinces, and of securing their sympathy and zeal in case of attack, was, so to speak, to have nothing in common with those provinces. I believe, on the contrary, that Lower Canada would gain by causing herself to be better known, and by causing the spirit of justice and of liberality which prevails among her inhabitants and her institutions, as they at present exist, to be