

tedium, with its meticulous attention to exquisite administrative detail, contemporary Canadians may learn something about themselves and what their history tells them of how they go about solving their problems, even problems of the highest questions of state such as those that Quebec asks today.

¹ John A. Rohr, To Run A Constitution: The Legitimacy of the Administrative State, (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1986); Founding Republics in France and America: A Study in Constitutional Governance (Lawrence KS: University Press of Kansas, 1995.)

² Hannah Arendt, On Revolution (New York: Viking Press, 1963): 214.

³ Unfortunately, the records of the Quebec Conference of October, 1864 are fragmentary at best. See A.G. Doughty, "Notes on the Quebec Conference, 1864," Canadian Historical Review (March, 1926): 26-47. For informative accounts of what is known about this conference, see Donald Creighton, The Road to Confederation: The Emergence of Canada, 1863-1867, (Toronto: Macmillan, 1964): chapters 5-6; W.L. Morton, The Critical Years: The Union of British North America, 1857-1873, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1964): 155-162; Robert Rumilly, Histoire de la Province de Québec, 2 vols. (Montréal: Editions Bernard Valiquette, 1941): I, 22-26; P.B. Waite, The Life & Times of Confederation 1864-1867, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962): chapter 7.

⁴ Parliamentary Debates on the Subject of the Confederation of the British North American Provinces, 3d Session, 8th Provincial Parliament of Canada, (Quebec: Hunter, Rose & Co., 1865.) Hereafter Debates. In referencing the Debates, I will give the page or pages and, where appropriate, I will also insert parenthetically the numbers 1 or 2 and the letters a, b, and c to indicate the column from which the citation was taken and its position within the column. Thus (2c) means the text cited can be found in the lowest third of the second column; (1a) means the top third of the first column; (1b) the middle third of the first column, etc.

⁵ To keep this article within manageable bounds, I had to confine its examination of the similarities between then and now to the three topics mentioned in the text. The choice was not an easy one. Many interesting topics must be saved for another day, the chief among them being the 1865 version of Quebec as a distinct society and the rights of the anglophone minority in Quebec. Readers interested in these topics will find helpful materials in the debates. Although I did not find the expression "distinct society" in ipsissimis verbis in the debates, the idea is certainly there. Usually it is expressed in terms of "peoples" and "races." As might be expected, there is considerable confusion and inconsistency in how these terms are used, just as is the case with today's "distinct society." There can be no doubt, however, that the fathers of Confederation saw Quebec as raising questions far more profound than those raised by the defining characteristics of the other provinces. Clearly, they did not see Quebec as simply a province comme les autres. On the distinct nature of Quebec, see the following passages: 29(1c); 85(16); 363(1a); 365(1a); 423(1b); 463(1b); 588(2c); 569-599; 601(1b); 779(2b)-780(1c); 794(1a); 823(1a); 892; 901(1a); 944-945; 984(2c)-985(1a.) These texts show that the distinctiveness of Quebec was seen as qualitatively different from attributes of the other provinces which made them different in their own way. See Debates, 91(1b);