



This manuscript is a product of the Canadian Studies Research Grant Program. The program promotes research in the social sciences, journalism, business, trade, environment, and law with a unique relevance to Canada, or in the context of the bilateral or North American relationship; and the social, cultural, political, and economic issues that impact on these relationships in the 1990s.

Research grants are designed to assist individual American scholars, a group of scholars, and/or scholars working with a cooperating Canadian institution, in writing an article-length manuscript of publishable quality that contributes to the development of Canadian Studies in the United States and reporting their findings in scholarly publications.

According to the terms and conditions of the grant, the rights of the manuscript remain the exclusive property of the researcher. Copies of the manuscript are provided to the Embassy and the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

Following Hannah Arendt's insights on the normative character of founding periods, this article examines the Confederation Debates of 1865 for whatever light they might shed upon contemporary constitutional quarrels in Canada. The article has three main sections. The first analyzes the differences between the constitutional arguments of 1865 and those one hears today. The second emphasizes the similarities between the same sets of arguments and the third examines the role played by the image of the United States in the Confederation Debates. Salient themes include the central role of public administration in Canadian constitutionalism, the distribution of powers in Canadian federalism, and the understanding of popular consent of 1865. Particular emphasis is placed upon the crucial and somewhat puzzling role played by the supporters of Confederation from Quebec and upon the similarities between the opponents of Confederation and the American Anti-Federalists of 1787-88.

54050228