of State, have brought before us and carried through the scheme of Confederation proposed. There may be certain faults of detail in the system: I grant that there are. But does not every work of man bear the impress of imperfection? Is the celebrated *Code Napoléon* perfect? The most celebrated French lawyers do not think it so; and yet this production is a master-piece of legislation in many respects. Does not the Constitution of the United States contain faults? and yet it is said to be a model work of its kind. I am of opinion that the plan of Confederation, taken as a whole, is the best we could desire or hope for, adapted, as it had to be, to the well-understood interests of the five provinces. To consider it from a purely sectional point of view, would be to misunderstand the position which a statesman should occupy. If however, Mr. SPEAKER, the unreasoning opponents of the proposed measure were able to suggest any means of meeting eventualities, and point out a way by which, while rejecting the scheme proposed, we might find some practical mode of escape from our difficulties, I should then be disposed to listen to them, and to compare their scheme with that which is now before us; but those gentlemen think it sufficient to blame and criticise. The celebrated Mr. RAMEAU even (the author of *La France aux Colonies*), from his retirement in distant France, sends forth a cry of alarm at the dangers with which he thinks Confederation is pregnant, but not a word of good counsel or of a better remedy of his own. Others cry aloud from the house-tops that this scheme is not a "Federal union," but a Legislative one in every point! If it were so, Mr. SPEAKER, I should be the first—and I proclaim it here before the whole country—I should be the first to scout and reject the scheme with all the power which Providence has given me; but as it is, on the contrary, a Federal union, in the full force of the term, having a Central Government invested with all the power necessary to obviate and remedy the weakness which characterises Federal Government in the American union, giving, in a special manner, to each province the management of its own local affairs, and to its inhabitants full and unrestricted power to make its own laws, I cannot, for the interest of my constituents, for my country's interest, help approving of a measure which, while it respects the rights and privileges of all, will have the effect of increasing the individual and collective strength of the five provinces, will secure to us the confidence of the Mother Country, and make of this section of British North America, under the powerful ægis of England, another *imperium in imperio*. (Cheers.) I return to those whose cry is, "But our nationality will be lost! Our language, our civil and religious institutions will disappear." O ye who cry so loudly, and who find such charms in the neighboring republic, do you think that if we fell into that whirl of divers nations and different religions composing the American Confederacy, which have no common traditions nor common history with us, French-Canadian nationality would long enjoy a separate existence, or that it would not speedily be lost amidst so many others? Answer if you can, and I will believe you. (Cheers.) Consider the fate of Louisiania, inhabited chiefly by French! Is not the English element in a majority in the Parliament of United Canada? And have I not, nevertheless, the honor to address you at this moment in French? in that beautiful language of our ancestors in which JACQUES CARTIER, in 1535, extolled the glories of our majestic St. Lawrence! (Cheers.) Would you know one of the reasons assigned against General FRÉMONT when he was a candidate for the Presidency of the United States a few years ago? "Do not vote for FRÉMONT," was the cry on the hustings and in the papers of the day; "FRÉMONT is a Frenchman"—"FRÉMONT is a Catholic"—and FRÉMONT lost his election accordingly. However, FRÉMONT was not a Catholic! but they said he was, and it was a crime sufficient in their eyes to disqualify him in his candidateship for their confidence, notwithstanding that they proclaim "liberty of conscience!" (Hear, hear.) Do they reject a man in England because he is a Catholic? Does that fact debar him from enjoying the confidence of his Sovereign and his fellow-citizens? Certainly it does not, and there are instances to prove it. Have we not often seen, in Canada, Catholics representing counties essentially Protestant? Was not the county of Vaudreuil, a county in which Catholics are a majority, lately represented by an English Protestant? Why should the English, under the Confederation, seek to destroy French-Canadian nationality? What interest could they serve in doing so? In