



SPEECHES AND ADDRESSES

CHIEFLY ON THE

SUBJECT OF BRITISH-AMERICAN UNION:

BY THE

Dec. No 32900

HON. THOMAS D'ARCY MCGEE, M.R.I.A.,

ONE OF THE MEMBERS FOR THE CITY OF MONTREAL, AND MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE FOR THE
PROVINCE OF CANADA

LONDON :

CHAPMAN AND HALL, 193, PICCADILLY.

1865.

LONDON
BRADBURY AND EVANS, PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS

701
710
471
M315

32900

E. W. WATKIN, ESQ.,

M.P. FOR STOCKPORT,

WHOSE INTIMATE CONNECTION WITH MANY GREAT ENTERPRISES
IN WHICH THE MATERIAL FUTURE OF BRITISH-
AMERICA IS INTERWOVEN,

AND, STILL MORE,

WHOSE HIGH-SPIRITED ADVOCACY OF A SOUND COLONIAL POLICY,
BOTH IN AND OUT OF PARLIAMENT, HAS CONFERRED
LASTING OBLIGATIONS UPON THESE PROVINCES,

This Volume

IS VERY SINCERELY AND CORDIALLY DEDICATED.

PREFACE.

THIS selection, from a large number of speeches and addresses, delivered during the past few years in the Canadian Parliament, or to public assemblies in the North-American Provinces, has been made, "at the request,"—to use a venerable formula—"of many friends."

The only object in making public at present such a selection, is, to contribute something, however inconsiderable, to the fullest discussion of what may be called the British-American question,

For the sake of convenience the speeches and addresses are arranged in two parts. I. Addresses delivered to special societies, or at popular gatherings. II. Speeches in the Canadian Parliament.

This division of the matter selected was intended, in the first place, to aid the "home" reader, personally unacquainted with those Provinces, in forming a fair estimate of the elements which go to make up the aggregate of our present British-American society; and in the second, to give some exemplification of the difficulties, local, sectional, and legislative, which the contemplated Confederation has had to encounter.

No one can be more conscious than the speaker himself of the deficiencies of every kind to be found in these speeches; they were sometimes made at short notice—sometimes ill-reported, and seldom corrected for the press: if, notwithstanding, they should be found to possess any saving interest, it can only be attributed to the fact that they form a tolerably consecutive running commentary, on the recent course of political opinion in the British Provinces; on the main events of the American civil war, and on the new relations arising for the Provinces out of those events; and, finally, on the efforts which have been made, especially during the last few years, to bring about the establishment of "a new Nationality," on monarchical principles, in British-America.

MONTREAL,

April 13th, 1865.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

ADDRESSES ON VARIOUS PUBLIC OCCASIONS.

	PAGE	
THE LAND WE LIVE IN	1	I.
THE POLICY OF CONCILIATION	6	II.
THE BORDER COUNTIES OF LOWER CANADA: THEIR RELATIONS WITH UNITED STATES	9	III.
CANADA'S INTEREST IN THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR	12	IV.
AMERICAN RELATIONS AND CANADIAN DUTIES	33	V.
BRITISH-AMERICAN UNION	38	VI.
CHARACTER OF CHAMPLAIN, THE FIRST CAPTAIN-GENERAL OF CANADA: THE FRENCH-CANADIANS UNDER FRANCE AND GREAT BRITAIN	43	VII.
OTTAWA, THE PROBABLE CAPITAL OF AN UNITED BRITISH AMERICA	51	VIII.
THE COMMON INTERESTS OF BRITISH NORTH AMERICA	56	IX.
INTERCOLONIAL RELATIONS AND THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY	68	X.
THE FUTURE OF CANADA	83	XI.
BISHOP'S COLLEGE, LENNOXVILLE, C.E.	93	XII.
PROSPECTS OF THE UNION	96	XIII.
"SOME OBJECTIONS TO A CONFEDERATION OF THE PROVINCES CONSIDERED"	100	XIV.
THE CAUSE OF THE QUEBEC CONFERENCE	108	XV.
GROWTH OF MONTREAL, AND ITS REQUIREMENTS	114	XVI.
THE GERMANS IN CANADA	117	XVII.
SPEECH AT COOKSHIRE, COUNTY OF COMPTON, DECEMBER 22, 1864	122	XVIII.
THE IRISH IN CANADA; THE IMPORTATION OF FENIANISM	141	XIX.

PART II.

SPEECHES IN CANADIAN PARLIAMENT.

	PAGE	<i>Col.</i>
"THE DOUBLE MAJORITY"	149	<i>1.</i>
CONSTITUTIONAL DIFFICULTIES BETWEEN UPPER AND LOWER CANADA	154	<i>11.</i>
REPRESENTATION BY POPULATION	177	<i>11.</i>
CONSTITUTIONAL DIFFICULTIES BETWEEN UPPER AND LOWER CANADA	182	<i>11.</i>
CANADIAN DEFENCES	199	<i>11.</i>
REPRESENTATION BY POPULATION	208	<i>11.</i>
EMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION	210	<i>11.</i>
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY DIPLOMACY	232	<i>11.</i>
STATE OF THE COUNTRY: PUBLIC DEFENCES	241	<i>11.</i>
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY DIPLOMACY	251	
SPEECH ON MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY IN FAVOUR OF CONFEDERATION	261	

PART I.
ADDRESSES ON VARIOUS PUBLIC
OCCASIONS.

Cap. I.

THE LAND WE LIVE IN.

ADDRESS TO THE "NEW ENGLAND SOCIETY OF MONTREAL, ON THE
ANNIVERSARY OF THE LANDING OF THE PILGRIMS," 22ND DECEMBER,
1860.

MR. MCGEE: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,—
As one of the Representatives of the city of Montreal, I
feel it to be an act of duty, and a most agreeable duty it is,
to attend the re-unions of our various National Societies,
and to contribute anything in my power to their gratifica-
tion. My respect for all these Societies, and my own
sense of what is decorous and fit to be said, have, I hope,
always confined me to the proprieties of such occasions;
but still, if I speak at all, I must speak with freedom, and
free speech, I trust, will never be asserted in vain among a
Society composed of the men of New England and their
descendants. I congratulate you and the Society over
which you preside, Mr. President, on the recurrence of
your favourite anniversary, and not only for your own
gratification as our fellow-citizens of Montreal, but in the
best interests of all humanity in the New World, let us
join in hope that not only the sons of New England, but
Americans from all other States settled amongst us, will
long be able to join harmoniously in the celebration of the
arrival of the first ship-load of emigrants in Massachusetts
Bay on this day, 240 years ago;—a ship which wafted over

the sea as large a cargo of the seeds of a new civilisation as any ship ever did, since the famous voyage recorded in the legends of the Greeks. It is rather a hard task this you have set me, Mr. President, of extolling the excellencies of "the land we live in"—that is, praising ourselves—especially at this particular season of the year. If it were mid-summer instead of mid-winter, when our rapids are flashing, and our glorious river sings its triumphal song from Ontario to the Ocean—when the northern summer, like the resurrection of the just, clothes every lineament of the landscape in beauty and serenity—it might be easy to say fine things for ourselves, without conflicting with the evidence of our senses. But to eulogise Canada about Christmas time requires a patriotism akin to the Laplander, when, luxuriating in his train oil, he declares that "there is no land like Lapland under the sun." Our consolation, however, is that all the snows of the season fall upon our soil for wise and Providential purposes. The great workman, Jack Frost, wraps the ploughed land in a warm covering, preserving the late sown wheat for the first ripening influence of the spring. He macadamizes roads and bridges, brooks and rivers, better than could the manual labour of 100,000 workmen. He forms and lubricates the track through the wilderness by which those sailors of the forest—the lumbermen—are enabled to draw down the annual supply of one of our chief staples, to the margins of frozen rivers, which are to bear their rafts to Quebec, at the first opening of the navigation. This climate of ours, though rigorous, is not unhealthful, since the average of human life in this Province is seven per cent. higher than in any other portion of North America; and if the lowness of the glass does sometimes inconvenience individuals, we ought to be compensated and consoled by remembering of how much benefit these annual falls of snow are to the country at large. So much for our climatic difficulties. Let me now say a word or two on our geographical position. Whoever looks at the map—a good map is an invaluable public instructor—not such maps as we used to have, in which Canada was stuck away up at

the North Pole, but such maps as have lately appeared in this country—will be tempted to regard the Gulf of St. Lawrence as the first of the Canadian Lakes, and our magnificent river as only a longer Niagara or Détroit. His eye will follow up through the greater part of the tidal volume of that river the same parallel of latitude—the 46°—which intersects Germany, and cuts through the British Channel; if he pursues that parallel, it will lead him to the valley of the Saskatchewan, and through the Rocky Mountain passes, to the rising settlements of our fellow-subjects on the Pacific. It will lead him through that most interesting country—the Red River territory, 500,000 square miles in extent, with a white population of less than 10,000 souls; a territory which ought to be “the Out-West” of our youth—where American enterprise has lately taught us a salutary, though a rebuking lesson, for while we were debating about its true limits and the title by which it is held, they were steaming down to Fort Garry, with mails and merchandise from St. Paul’s. The position of Canada is not only important in itself, but it is important as a *Via media* to the Pacific; from a given point on our side of Lake Superior to navigable water on the Fraser River has been shown to be not more than 2000 miles—about double the distance from Boston to Chicago. A railway route, with gradients not much, if at all, exceeding those of the Vermont Central, or the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, has been traced throughout by Mr. Fleming, Mr. Hind, Mr. Dawson, Captain Syngé, and Colonel Pallisser; and though neither Canada nor Columbia are able of themselves to undertake the connexion, we cannot believe that British and American enterprise, which risked so many precious lives to find a practicable passage nearer to the Pole, will long leave untried this safest, shortest, and most expeditious overland North-West passage. We cannot despair that the dream of Jacques Cartier may yet be fulfilled, and the shortest route from Europe to China be found through the valley of the St. Lawrence. Straight on to the West lies Vancouver’s Island, the Cuba of the Pacific; a little to the North, the Amoor, which may be

called the Amazon of the Arctic; farther off, but in a right line, the rich and populous Japanese group, which for wealth and enterprise have not been inaptly called the British Isles of Asia. These, Mr. President, are some of our general geographical advantages; there are others that I might refer to, but on an occasion of this kind I know the fewer details the better. Now, one word more as to our people: the decennial census to be taken next month will probably show us to be nearly equal in numbers to the six States of New England, or the great State of New York, deducting New York city. An element, over a third, but less than one-half of that total, will be found to be of French Canadian origin; the remainder is made up, as the population of New York and New England has been, by British, Irish, German, and other emigrants and their descendants. Have we advanced materially in the ratio of our American neighbours? I cannot say that we have. Montreal is an older city than Boston, and Kingston an older town than Oswego or Buffalo. Let us confess frankly that in many material things we are half a century behind the Americans, while, at the same time—not to give way altogether too much—let us modestly assert that we possess some social advantages which they, perhaps, do not. For example, we believed until lately—we still believe—that such a fiction as a slave, as one man being another man's chattel, was wholly unknown in Canada.* And we still hope that may ever continue to be our boast. In material progress we have something to show; and we trust to have more. All we need, Mr. President, mixed up and divided as we naturally are, is, in my humble opinion, the cultivation of a tolerant spirit on all the delicate controversies of race and religion,—the maintenance of an upright public opinion in our politics and commerce,—the cordial encouragement of every talent and every charity which

* An allusion to the recent case of Anderson, arrested and tried in Upper Canada, on the charge of killing his master, while attempting to escape, in Missouri. He was finally acquitted by the Upper Canada Court of Appeal, but not until a writ of *habeas corpus* had been issued from the Queen's Bench, at Westminster.

ADDRESSES ON VARIOUS PUBLIC OCCASIONS. 5

~~Reminders~~
reveals itself among us,—the expansion of those narrow views and small ambitions which are apt to attend upon Provincialism,—and with these amendments, I do think we might make for Christian men, desirous to bring up their posterity in the love and fear of God and the law, one of the most desirable residences in the world, of this “land we live in.”

McG.

THE POLICY OF CONCILIATION.

REMARKS AT MONTREAL, MARCH, 1861.

IN reply to the toast of his health, at a dinner given him by his constituents, on the eve of the session of 1861, Mr. McGee (after some local observations) said: The career I have had in Canada led me chiefly into those parts of the country inhabited by men who speak the English language, and using the opportunities which I have had between the time when I ceased to be a newspaper publisher to that of my admission as a member of the Lower Canada bar, I trust I have learned something which may be profitable to me in the position to which you elevated me on trust and in advance. The result of my observations, thus made, is, that there is nothing to be more dreaded in this country than feuds arising from exaggerated feelings of religion and nationality. On the other hand, the one thing needed for making Canada the happiest of homes, is to rub down all sharp angles, and to remove those asperities which divide our people on questions of origin and religious profession. The man who says this cannot be done consistently with any set of principles founded on the charity of the Gospel or on the right use of human reason, is a blockhead, as every bigot is,—while under the influence of his bigotry he sees no further than his nose. For a man who has grown to years of discretion—though some never do come to those years—who has not become wedded to one idea, who, like Coleridge, is as ready to regulate his conduct as to set his watch when the parish clock declares it wrong; who is ready to be taught by high as well as by low, and to receive any stamp of truth—I may say that such a man will come to this conclusion: that there are in all origins

men good, bad, and indifferent; yet for my own part, my experience is that in all classes the good predominate. I believe that there have come out of Ireland, noble as she is, those whom she would not recognise as her children; and so with other countries celebrated for the noble characteristics of their population as a whole. In Canada, with men of all origins and all kinds of culture, if we do not bear and forbear, if we do not get rid of old quarrels, but on the contrary make fresh ones,—whereas we ought to have lost sight of the old when we lost sight of the capes and headlands of the old country—if we will carefully convey across the Atlantic half-extinguished embers of strife in order that we may by them light up the flames of our inflammable forests—if each neighbour will try not only to nurse up old animosities, but to invent new grounds of hostility to his neighbour—then, gentlemen, we shall return to what Hobbes considered the state of Nature—I mean a state of war. In society we must sacrifice something, as we do when we go through a crowd, and not only must we yield to old age, to the fairer and better sex, and to that youth which, in its weakness, is entitled to some of the respect which we accord to age; but we must sometimes make way for men like ourselves, though we could prove by the most faultless syllogism our right to push them from the path. In his great speech respecting the Unitarians, Edmund Burke declared that he did not govern himself by abstractions or universals, and he maintained in that same argument (I think) that what is not possible is not desirable—that the possible best is the absolute best—the best for the generation, the best for the man, since the shortness of life makes it impossible for him to achieve all that he could wish. I believe the possible best for us is peace and good-will. With this belief I did my part to heal up those feuds which prevailed in Montreal and westward before and at the election of 1857; I felt that some one must condone the past, and I determined, so far as I could be supposed to represent your principles, to lead the way; I tried to allay irritated feeling, and I hope not altogether without success. We have a country which,

224.11.

being the land of our choice, should also have our first consideration. I know, and you know, that I can never cease to regard with an affection which amounts almost to idolatry the land where I spent my best, my first years, where I obtained the partner of my life, and where my first-born saw the light. I cannot but regard that land even with increased love because she has not been prosperous. Yet I hold we have no right to intrude our Irish patriotism on this soil; for our first duty is to the land where we live and have fixed our homes, and where, while we live, we must find the true sphere of our duties. While always ready therefore to say the right word, and to do the right act for the land of my forefathers, I am bound above all to the land where I reside; and especially am I bound to put down, so far as one humble layman can, the insensate spread of a strife which can only tend to prolong our period of Provincialism and make the country an undesirable home for those who would otherwise willingly cast in their lot among us. We have acres enough; powers mechanical and powers natural; and sources of credit enough to make out of this Province a great nation, and, though I wish to commit no one to my opinion, I trust that it will not only be so in itself, but will one day form part of a greater British North American State, existing under the sanction, and in perpetual alliance with the Empire, under which it had its rise and growth.

Cape III.

THE BORDER COUNTIES OF LOWER CANADA: THEIR RELATIONS WITH UNITED STATES.

REMARKS AT A POLITICAL PIC-NIC AT ORNSTOWN, COUNTY OF CHATEAUGUAY, JULY 17TH, 1861.*

Mr. McGEE said: I am very grateful to you, my friends, for your cordial reception, and to my friend, your worthy member (Mr. Starnes), for the flattering recommendation to your notice which he has just given me. I now understand, when I see him moving about among his constituents, one great secret of his popularity, in the unaffected friendly feeling with which you and he meet, and interchange opinions with each other. For myself, my friends, why am I here? I answer, because you desired it, and your respected representative seconded the request. Being here, what can I say that may interest or instruct you? Mere speaking, for speech-sake, I hold to be almost the lowest exercise of human capacity; but if there be things to be said, which are at once fit for the place, the time, the audience, and the speaker, such speech as that can never be superfluous or impertinent, ill-timed, or in bad taste. Two or three incidents occurred to my honourable friend and myself on our way to this place, which gave me mental occupation along the road, and suggested to me observations which, with one or two others of a more general nature, I very gladly offer you as my mite towards the objects of this festival at Ormstown. The chief of these observations, which I shall present to you before I close, concerns our own social state in Lower Canada; and the other, to which I mean to refer in the first place, concerns

* The period of the first battle of Bull's Run.

our present and future relations with the Americans, your next-door neighbours. We stand here on the historic soil of Chateauguay, where De Salaberry, with his handful of volunteers, repulsed an army in the last war, as American armies were then numbered; we are here within two hours' ride of the American line; your relations and the relations of the adjoining counties, with our neighbours in Western New York, especially since the establishment of the Reciprocity Treaty, are of the most intimate and cordial character. Is it not so? Every true Canadian, every true American, wishes to preserve and perpetuate these peaceful relations. Is it not so? Now, if this be the determination on both sides, there can be little possibility of a rupture, and I therefore entirely agree with the sentiments of those statesmen who think that the late infusion of a small standing army into our old garrisons was of questionable policy. I do not pretend to know upon what representations such an addition to the regular army in this country was made; but if it was made with any feeling of apprehension as to our relations with our neighbours across the line, I think it was premature and unnecessary. It may be what is called an error on the right side, but I confess I look for the preservation of peace between ourselves and the American people far more to the cultivation of a just and generous style of dealing with the national troubles of that people, than I would to the presence here of a few thousand regulars more or less. We have everything to lose, and nothing to gain, by adopting any other tone or any other tactics, and I repeat here, at this the earliest opportunity I have had, what I said in my place in the last Parliament, that all this wretched small-talk about the failure of the Republican experiment in the United States ought to be frowned down, wherever it appears, by the Canadian public. I am not a Republican in politics; long before these recent troubles came to a head in the American Union, I had ceased to dogmatise upon any abstract scheme of government; but I have no hesitation in declaring my own hope and belief—a belief founded on evidence accumulated through several years of observation—that the American

system, so far from having proved a failure—that that system may emerge from this, its first great domestic trial, purified, consolidated, disciplined, for greater usefulness and greater achievements than before. It is then, it seems to me, the duty of Canadian statesmen to look through the temporary to the lasting relations we are to sustain to our next neighbours; to suppress and discountenance all ungenerous exultation at the trials and tribulations which they are now undergoing; to show them, on the contrary, in this the day of their adversity, that while preferring on rational grounds the system of Constitutional monarchy for ourselves and our children—while preferring to lodge within the precincts of the Constitution elaborated through ages by the highest wisdom of the British Islands, we can at the same time be just, nay, generous, to the merits of the kindred system, founded by their fathers, in the defensive and justifiable war of their Revolution. If we are freemen so are they, and the public calamities which befall one free people can never be matter of exultation to another, so long as the world is half darkened by despotism, as it is. The American system is the product of the highest political experience of modern times, working in the freest field, cast adrift from all European ties, by the madness of an arbitrary minister, blind to all circumstances of time and place; if that fabric should be destined to fall—as fall I firmly believe it will not in our day, nor at any early day,—the whole world must feel the shock, and all the civilised parts of the earth might well be clothed in mourning, if they only understood the value of what they had lost. I am told there are several American citizens here present: I was not before aware of the fact; but if there are, I beg them to take from me, as one of the public men of this Province, that, so far as I am aware, with few and unimportant exceptions, the press and people of Canada are anxiously and sincerely desirous that they may be able soon to settle their domestic troubles, and that the future course of their Confederation may be as free from anarchical dangers as it has been hitherto, since the days of Washington.

2/11/14

CANADA'S INTEREST IN THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR.

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED DURING THE AGRICULTURAL EXHIBITION, AT
LONDON, C.W., SEPTEMBER, 26TH, 1861.

MR. MCGEE said: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:—Many of you have been kind enough, through my much esteemed friend near me (Mr. Frank Smith), to invite me to speak to you on the subject of "Canada's Interest in the American Civil War." Though you come together from all parts of the Province with a very different object—though you have dedicated this week to compare notes and statistics with each other—though you have been occupied inspecting the plentiful fruits with which an all-gracious Providence has crowned the year—though your imaginations have been busy with the wheat field, the meadow, and the orchard—it was thought that we might spend an evening not unprofitably in considering how far we are likely to be affected in our peaceful progress, our domestic industry, and our external relations, by the stirring events which are taking place on the soil of Virginia and Missouri. Our friends were of opinion—and I fully agree with them—that while cultivating our own fields in peace, under the broad banner of the triple cross—that while cherishing with a natural preference our own institutions, copied in general after the model furnished by our Island ancestors, we still cannot be insensible to the revolution attempted to the south of those great lakes, upon which a portion of Upper Canadians dwell and depend, and from which we in Lower Canada derive most of our freights and exchanges. Standing as we do to the north of the North, riding safely by the firm

anchorage of a system of self-government, the most liberal that metropolis ever conceded to colony, since the emigrating ages of the Greeks—bound up with the fortunes of a great empire by “links light as air, yet strong as iron,” we conceive that the public intelligence of Canada is sufficiently centred in itself, sufficiently calm, unbiassed, and comprehensive, to form opinions for ourselves, neither parrotted after the organs of the North, nor echoed after the orators of the South. In meeting—in discussing this subject at all—I am sure it is your desire, I can safely say it is mine, that we should utter no word without deliberation and forethought—that if we are to be quoted anywhere as any evidence of the public opinion of this Province, the Province may not be discredited by the spirit in which we speak, nor by the meaning, intent, and substance of what we say. We all feel, Mr. Chairman, that, end how it may, this surprising civil war is destined to form the third great epoch in the annals of the new world. As Columbus’s discovery made the first, and Washington’s success the second, so this great insurrection of the Africanized States against the Federal authority must be considered the third epoch in American history. It is an epoch, however, yet unformed, whose issue is in the future, whose events are upon the march, and, therefore, to be spoken of by a prudent looker-on with many reservations. In Canada we have this advantage over both North and South, in their present blood-heat temper: we can express ourselves, without fear of censorship or Lynch law, whenever we do see our way clearly, and feel that there is a principle at stake. While I feel buoyed up in an atmosphere of free speech, I must add, on the other hand, that I feel borne down almost to speechlessness by the vastness of the subject. I cannot comprehend—I cannot imagine—how any rational being could approach such a subject in a light, or flippant, or gratified spirit. I cannot conceive the perversity of nature, the hopeless scepticism in man’s self-government, which could make any one applaud at such a national tragedy—at the miserable prospect of a whole continent given over to bloodshed, rapine, and revolution. But of all men, I can

least conceive the mental state of that English-speaking man, who can hear with satisfaction the language of which he is justly proud—the speech so rich in new and old wisdom—the tongue which we all had hoped a little while ago was dedicated for ever to herald peaceful progress throughout the earth—I cannot conceive the mental state of such a man, of any party, who can hear with satisfaction that language employed in the stern exchange of challenges and countersigns, along all the great central rivers of North America. Since the first dawn of this century the English tongue has not hitherto given expression to the barbarous passions of civil war; and it was one, not of the least, among the services of the Federal constitution to the continent, that men of the same speech—intelligible to each other for all purposes of good, while they obeyed that supreme authority, were neither tempted, nor driven, nor led—at least not in multitudes—to defame each other, in a language whose resources of vituperation are only inferior to its adaptability for free intercourse, for calm argument, and for all the kindly and dignified offices of public and private life. The interests of Canada in the American civil war are, in general, the interest of all free governments, and in particular the interest of a next neighbour, having a thousand miles of frontier and many social enterprises in common with the Republic. We are ourselves an American people geographically and commercially, though we retain our British connection; our situation is continental, and our politics, in the largest and best sense, must needs be continental. It is true our Federal capital is on the other side of the Atlantic, not on this; but although subject to a constitutional monarchy in our external affairs, we claim to be as free a people—indeed, we flatter ourselves we are a freer people—than our neighbours of New York, or New England, or the North-western States. As a free people, with absolute domestic self-government, with local liberties, bound up in an Imperial Union, governed by our own majority constitutionally ascertained, we are as deeply interested in the issue of the present unhappy contest, as any of the States of the United States; while,

as a North American people, Canadians are more immediately and intimately concerned in the issue than any other population, not excepting the West Indians or the Mexicans. Let us glance first at the merits of this most unhappy contest. Are the Slave States engaged in a lawful resistance to Federal despotism, or in a wanton assault on the legitimate central authority? To answer this question clearly, it is necessary to look back from the election of last November, in which Mr. Lincoln obtained the votes of a clear majority of the thirty-two States, to the date of the formation of the government by the original thirteen. There cannot, in my opinion, be a doubt on the mind of any one who looks carefully into the historical argument, that the signers of the Declaration of Independence rejected in that document the modern doctrine of Southern slavery; nor that the authors of the Constitution of 1789 regarded its *status* as merely municipal; nor that the framers of the North-west Ordinance of 1787 regarded it in the same light; nor that those of the Fathers who declared that the African slave trade should be adjudged piracy after 1808, looked upon "the peculiar institution" as a baleful tree, to be girdled and finally cut down, rather than to be propagated and fostered, and, like the sacred tree of Abyssinia, invoked and idolized. Of late years, almost within my own recollection, a new doctrine has overrun the South, that slavery is national, not local—constitutional, not temporary; and as it is the nature of one falsehood not to be able to stand alone—as a lie, to stand at all, must be triangulated—so this fallacy has begotten a false philosophy to strengthen it, a false theology to sanctify it; and it has had its day. In asserting its more than municipal pretensions, the slave interest were compelled to buttress it up with the strange doctrines of State sovereignty and the right of secession—to deny, therefore, to the Federal power the prerogatives of what Webster called "a government proper," endued with the first power of all governments—self-preservation. The previous political question—to the question of Federal oppression—is this: Was the Federal authority "a government proper"? It may be examined

Cap. IV.

historically, or upon the internal evidence of the Constitution, or both. It is certain that the Federal power was first constituted by the cession of ample sovereign attributes by all the people of the thirteen revolted Colonies. All the parties to that compact gave up the treaty-making and war-making powers; the power to coin money; to establish a Supreme Court of Judicature; to pass an uniform law for the admission of citizens by naturalisation.— Virginia gave up her lands, New York gave up her customs, and almost every essential sign and substance of sovereignty became invested in the Federal Administration. If there is any proviso of secession, it must be found in the Federal Constitution; but there is no such proviso there; that instrument confers essential prerogatives of sovereignty, but is dumb as to any imaginable *modus* for the withdrawal of a State from its State allegiance. Secession is, in this view, a mere question of force—of revolution; and resolves itself into just this: Are the Slave States able to break the bonds with which their fathers bound them, but which they are no longer willing to be bound by? Question of constitutional or conventional right there is none, even for those of the original thirteen States, who now seek to withdraw from their allegiance. But with the more recently acquired States—in the case of Louisiana, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Missouri, Arkansas, and Texas, purchased by Federal money and Federal blood—drawn into being by the warmth and nurture of the Federal power—conquered and colonised by Federal arms and Federal laws—the crime of treason is aggravated by the vice of ingratitude, and their secession partakes, in an extreme degree, of the taint of constitutional and conventional repudiation and wrong.

And from what description of government is it these States are so eager to break away? By their own declaration, from a government hostile to “the extension” of human slavery; a government whose original sin is, in their eyes, the grand declaration, that “all men”—black as well as white—“are endowed with certain inalienable privileges, among which are, life, liberty, and the pursuit of

happiness"—a government which, wide-spread as were its arms, and various as were the interests it embraced, was never accused, even by the hottest zealot, of hostility to the general interests of the South, until the day of Mr. Lincoln's inauguration. On that day, the rebellion, however, was already organised and on foot, under the plea of approaching, rather than of actual, injustice. Thus the cardinal American doctrine—which is British doctrine, too—that the majority, constitutionally ascertained, should rule, was flung to the wind, along with the elder doctrine of inherent natural right; and all that beneficent, elastic system, which has been so long the international law—the system of equilibrium of the new world;—thus the flag, the history, the fame of a common nationality were cast off like a garment out of season;—thus the wisdom of three generations was undone in the madness of a month, and a system, consecrated by the highest genius and the highest virtue of the eighteenth century, was contemptuously rejected by the presumption and petulance of the nineteenth. This terrible reverse may, no doubt, have fallen upon that too prosperous people for some wise, providential end. Those who believe in the retributions of history, imagine they see in it the well-deserved punishment of inordinate ambition. Not satisfied with the overthrow of British power in the original thirteen States, there was a periodical menace held out to British America; not content with the subjugation of the Spanish race in Florida, Texas, and California, there was a like menace held out against Cuba, and Mexico, and Central America. The Monroe doctrine, as expounded at San Juan, has not been entirely forgotten among us. But by far the least defensible series of republican aggressions were those committed upon the aboriginal nations. Whole tribes which, like the Powhattans and the Lenni Lenappe, could count their warriors by tens of thousands, when the white man's axe first smote their shelter, are now absolutely extinct. East of the Mississippi there remain not above 10,000 aborigines; west of that river, all the remnants of all the tribes combined—adding 100,000 for California—do not exceed, in the total, 350,000. In removing these

remnants from their old hunting-grounds, all the forms of law were scrupulously observed; the Indian treaties of the Union are an immense collection; but it is impossible to reconcile with any notion of natural right, or conventional justice, such purchases as were made, from the Osage tribe for instance, of 48,000,000 acres of land, for the wretched stipend of \$1000 a-year, payable to the chiefs! Still, it must be admitted that in these transactions the Federal policy was mild and merciful compared to the sanguinary intolerance of individual States—such as Arkansas, Florida, and Georgia. Nor is it an insignificant fact, that while, thus far (and I trust it will be so to the end), the Federal government has humanely refused to enlist the tomahawk and the scalping knife on its side, the Confederate authorities are said to have called back the Cherokee to the eastern war-path, from which he was years ago banished, in the name of Western civilisation.*

South of the Texian border, men see, no doubt, in recent events, another lesson of retribution. The spoil of Mexico has proved the shirt of Nessus to the North. With California, came in an excess of luxury which has been too sudden to be safe. The extension of the Union to the Pacific, before the intervening south-western prairies were surveyed, not to say colonised, was no doubt a violence done to Nature, and as such it has been avenged. But we should remember on this head, that the invasion of Texas—the Santa Fe expedition, the descent on California, the fillibuster forays into South America, were mainly acts of that floating, turbulent Mississippi population, who are the chief authors of the present insurrection. Judged by the event, it would seem that Aaron Burr appeared on that river half a century too soon; had he lived in this generation he would have found fewer legal scruples to overcome—he would have been received in Richmond, not as a culprit to be tried for conspiracy, but as a hero to be honoured for his enterprising patriotism.

* This statement, though generally believed at the time, was not, I am happy to say, subsequently found to be correct.

ADDRESSES ON VARIOUS PUBLIC OCCASIONS. 19

Yet vast as the extent of the Union became within the last few years, it may be observed that, between the Rocky Mountains and the Atlantic at least, there is no natural barrier to its governmental unity. A canoe launched on the upper waters of the Missouri, within sight of those snowy summits, may, with a few portages, make its way to the levee at New Orleans; a pine, felled on the Cattaraugus hills, within sight of Lake Erie, may be floated from the Alleghany to the Ohio, and so to the same port with the canoe from Kansas or Dacotah. An old English ballad tells us how—

The Avon to the Severn runs—
The Severn to the sea.

And still more strikingly federal is the river system of this continent, south of the great lakes. Our system also is complete in itself, for we have not a single tributary of size flowing towards us from the south; but it is to be observed of the American Union, that if it had the ambition of a giant it had also the framework of a giant. From another bond of almost equal force with the language and the river system—the memory of a common *Pater Patria*—the Secessionists are likewise labouring to break away. In him the South as much as the North, and the North as the South, were accustomed to hold forth the great exemplar of patriotism, the highest type of their national character. Yet it now seems doubtful whether, in the hollow repetitions of his praise, the leaders of the Slave States cared to bestow any great degree of study on his character. Though far from being the bloodless myth that vulgar panegyrists have made him—though capable of anger which transported him to the utterance of an oath, and of contrition which humbled him to the earth, George Washington was, take him for all in all, the New-World's noblest creature—the least faulty public man of modern times. His striking transition from the camp to civil life always suggests to me, though in another sense than the author wrote it, the Scandinavian poet's eulogy on the martial astronomer of Uranienborg—

"The good Knight ceased to walk on
The fields of war and gore,
His sword and helm the balk on
He hung to use no more.

"And he his eye projected
Into the night afar,
And keen the course inspected
Of every twinkling star."

The grave of Washington ought to have consecrated the valley of the Potomac to peace and union for ever. Will those who now battle about that tomb partition out his dust when they have rent asunder his system? Could either side assume sole custody of those pregnant ashes? To me, the violence done to all actualities, to the living language, the living kindred, and the river system, seems less monstrous and unnatural than this violence done to the maxims and memory of the *Pater Patria*, by the very means of all others he most abhorred and deprecated—civil war and sectional hostility.

The next question to be considered is, the species of government the seceded States propose to themselves if they should come successfully out of the conflict. They intend to call it a Republic, but they do not attempt to deny that it is to be a pagan Republic—an Oligarchy founded upon caste, the caste founded upon colour. A Republic founded upon the servile labour of 4,000,000 blacks to begin with; with 200,000 or 300,000 planters, and the rest of the white population—over 7,000,000 rather freedmen than freemen; such an Oligarchy, stripped of all disguises, being of the newest, must be of the most exacting and intolerant description. Such an Oligarchy would combine some of the worst features of the worst system hitherto endured by mankind; a rule of caste as inexorable as obtains in India; a Patrician power of life and death; a Spanish contempt of mechanic industry; a Venetian espionage; a Carthaginian subtlety and craft. Organise an American power on such a basis, give it a flag, a Senate, a military aristocracy, a literature, and a history, and you condemn mankind on this continent to begin over again.

the great battle of first principles, which, in the Christian parts of the earth, were thought to have been settled and established some centuries ago. As long as the monstrous doctrines of the innate diversity of the human race, the incurable barbarism of the black, and the hereditary master-ship of the white, were confined to individuals, or States, or sections, they were comparatively harmless; but build a government on such a basis; accept 300,000 whites as the keepers and lords of life and death over 4,000,000 blacks; erect an entire social and political superstructure on that foundation, and contemplate, if you can, without horror, the problems and the conflicts you are preparing for posterity!

For, gentlemen, evade it as diplomacy may, what would be the effect of the recognition of such a Republic? If the northern boundary of Maryland (near the 40° parallel) is to be continued to the Pacific, or if the Missouri compromise line of 36° 30' is to be continued, slavery will obtain a larger territory than freedom, north of the equator. We will thus place beneath the feet of a few hundred thousand men, a country larger than all the Free States, or all British America combined; a country—exclusive of Mexico—already extending over 15 degrees of latitude, and 40 degrees of longitude; a country abounding in cereal and in tropical products, called for in all the markets of the world. The labour to cultivate this vast scope of continent, so governed, must be servile labour, and the only race of slaves accessible to the new oligarchy are in Africa. The Gulf of Guinea would soon be familiar with the new flag. Once salute it with the honours due to sovereignty in British waters, and you send it with your sanction to the Congo and the Senegal.—While missionaries and men of science are penetrating the inmost recesses of Africa, some by way of Mount Atlas, others through Egypt and Abyssinia, others tracing the line across its vast extent, others starting from Zanzibar and Mozambique—while all this heroism of science and of the cross is exhibited to us on that mysterious stage, are we prepared to sanction the erection of new barracoons on the slave coast, and new

Cap. 11.

auction marts for human creatures along the cotton coast? Has the benevolence and science of Europe explored the land only to bring the slave seller and the slave buyer more readily together? Is dense night to settle down again on all the 60,000,000 who people that forlorn and melancholy region? For of one thing we must rest certain, the government that recognises a slave power on the Gulf of Mexico, recognises by one and the same act that slave power in the Gulf of Guinea. Was it not enough for Europe to have fastened such an evil on the infant societies of the New World, that she now, in the hour of hope for its extinction, comes to the rescue to perpetuate the crime? What has become of all the public penances done for that sin of our ancestors, of all the declarations against slavery and the slave trade? Are they all to be unsaid, renounced, controverted, because Manchester is alarmed for its cotton, and Liverpool and Havre are averse to the blockade? We, in Canada, must feel deeply whatever concerns the prosperity of the Empire; we should grieve to hear of want and suffering in Lancashire, as much as if it were in one of our own populous counties; but we know there is cotton in Brazil, in India, in Egypt, in Surat: we know that cotton grows readily in Guinea, in Jamaica, in Queensland; and we have an abiding faith that the glorious stand taken by the Empire in recent days against African slavery, will not be deserted, because there may be a short supply of a single staple, which in a very few years may be effectually remedied, not only for the present but also for the future of the trade. I do not underrate the vital importance to England of an ample supply of cotton; there are a million mortals depending on that industry; but there is capital enough in England, and there are cotton-fields enough in the rest of the world, to enable Manchester to shake off her dependance on slave labour and now is the time in which that long-desired change can be wrought—once and for ever.

Being a continental people, we have to consider for ourselves, whether we ought to welcome a new era in the military organisation of this continent—whether we ought

to do or say anything to hasten the advent of such an era. We have been steadily making friends of our republican neighbours during the last twenty years. What have we to expect in the combinations of the future that we do not possess, or that we may not obtain, if their union be preserved? The friendship of the South, in return for our sympathy? Our institutions are too entirely dissimilar to make such a political friendship possible, even if it were desirable, and if the Free States did not interpose their whole extent between us and them; while, judged by the only examples which are vast enough to match this immense disruption—the breaking up of Alexander's Empire—of the Roman Empire—of Mahomedan unity—of Papal unity at the Reformation—the different dogmas for which these combatants fight, the different systems they hold sacred, must lead to an era of standing armies, of passports, of espionage, of fluctuating boundaries, and border wars. Are we prepared to welcome a state of permanent and still-increasing armaments for North America; are we prepared by word, or deed, or sign, or secret sympathy, to hasten the advent of such times, for our posterity, if not ourselves? I sincerely trust that a wiser and a nobler sense of our position and duties will direct and instruct us to a wiser and nobler use of whatever influence we may possess with the mother country in the present exigency. There is another consideration: if two English-speaking powers take the place of the one with which alone the Empire has had to deal these 80 years past, there will inevitably arise a balance, and a rivalry of diplomacy, between them. If cotton is strong enough to bind England to the South, and if England becomes the intimate ally of the one power, France, her great western rival, will cultivate the most amicable relations with the other. If England makes herself necessary at Richmond, she will cause France to become necessary at Washington; and France will not be slow to cultivate the affections of the North. Strange as it may seem (such is the elasticity of French manners), it is nevertheless true, that the French naval and military officers were highly popular in the war

Cy. IV.

of Independence, when stationed at Philadelphia, New York, and Newport. Since France parted with her own possessions upon this continent, it has been her traditional policy to build up a West-Atlantic power to combat with England. It was the policy of the old *noblesse*, who ruled France in 1777; it was the policy of Napoleon I., when he gave up Louisiana, from the Gulf to the Minnesota line, to Jefferson; it is the same policy, which, according to report, led a French prince, very near the throne, to drink to the success of the North, in his recent visit to the other side of the Lakes. The North being the second maritime power—the second Atlantic power—would form, in alliance with France, a most serious rivalry to England's maritime ascendancy; and I leave you, gentlemen, to ponder over the probable consequences of such an alliance in our waters, or along our thousand miles of frontier, originally explored, and at several points first colonised, from France.

In the first stages of the contest, it seemed to me and others, that the public sympathy in this country was altogether with the North. Some offensive bravado from one or two New York newspapers was made use of by some one or more Canadian journals, to arrest, to turn back the genial currents of that sympathy. A pretence was next made that it was a war undertaken from a lust of dominion, and not from any sincere love of liberty. Because the Federal government, which always recognised slavery as the creature of the municipal law south of the Pennsylvania line, did not rashly set that municipal law at nought; therefore, it was not at all a war for freedom! It would require very little argument—none at all, if the view I have taken of the merits of the controversy be correct—to prove that a war for the unity of the Republic must be necessarily, *ipso facto*, a war for liberty. The dogmas on which the Republic is founded are genuine articles of every freeman's creed; like the dogmas of the Christian religion itself, they are held in deposit by the Federal hierarchy; one age or one generation is not sufficient to exhaust or to develope all their latent salutary

efficacy. It may be that the keepers have not always proved worthy of their trust, that the expositors have not comprehended the true spirit of their own doctrine; but he must be a very impatient, a very unreasonable American reformer, who would not be content with the progress the anti-slavery cause has made, from the days when Mr. Garrison had a halter round his neck in Boston, till the day when Mr. Lincoln was carried on the Chicago platform into the presidential mansion. The fears of the South for the perpetuity of slavery are better evidence than the sophisms of our anti-American editors and orators. They felt the decisive hour gradually but surely drawing nigh, and desiring to guard against every possibility of peaceful emancipation, they are now battling for an opportunity to reconstitute their entire system on the abominable foundation of the eternal bondage of the blacks. Is not battling to put down such a scheme, *ipso facto*, making war for freedom?

Another argument calculated to prejudice the Canadian mind is this, that the Free are endeavouring to enforce upon the Slave States the very same superiority which their revolutionary fathers denied to Great Britain. If I understand the merits of the American revolution, there is no parallel whatever in the causes of quarrel. In the days of Washington, Mr. Grenville, Lord North, and the other authors of that revolt—for the seeds were shipped from England which were harvested in America,—held that they had an Imperial right to tax the colonies without the consent of their legislatures; and they practically tested that right, first in the Stamp Act, and afterwards in the Tea Tax. Has there been any pretence set up by the South that Congress, the Imperial power, has violated the existing rights or the municipal institutions of any one of the States subject to its superiority? Has there been any direct or indirect interference with the domestic institution, since the slave trade was declared piracy in 1808? The compromises of 1820 and 1850—the adoption of Mr. Douglas's principle of the right of territories to admission to the Union, with or without slavery, as they should themselves

C. A. P. M.

determine; the decision of the Supreme Court in the celebrated "Dred Scott case," were all concessions to the South, or, more strictly speaking, to the desire to perpetuate the Union. Nor, looking at it calmly, from the point of view of history, do I feel disposed to admit that Chief Justice Taney, or Mr. Douglas, or Mr. Clay, went too far, paid too high a price, for the preservation of the Federal bond. The ordinary American mind has been, for a generation or two, so occupied in the contemplation of the blessings of liberty, that it has neglected or overlooked the co-equal worth of unity. This war—this great adversity bursting like a summer thunderstorm in their clear sky—will lead them to inquire into many phenomena in the heavens above and the earth beneath. Discipline and subordination in war will teach them the value of unity and obedience to laws in time of peace. They will learn that unity is to liberty as the cistern in the desert to the seldom sent shower; that of liberty we may truly say, though Providence should rain it down upon our heads, though the land should thirst for it, till it gaped at every pore, without a legal organisation to retain, without a supreme authority to preserve the Heaven-sent blessing, all in vain are men called free, all in vain are States declared to be independent. The contest waged by King George III. against the thirteen United Colonies was a contest to assert the Imperial right of taxation; a right unheard of, as Mr. Burke proved, before the year 1764; a right which we in Canada, loyal as we are, would resist as stoutly as did the Americans in 1776; but the Southern States, in their several "ordinances of secession," have not alleged any parallel innovation on their domestic rights against the United States government. They have alleged a case of oppression, without particulars; there are no specific counts in their indictment; it is one broad general assumption, or assertion, of sovereignty reserved and danger apprehended. Now, as theologians contend that there can be no such thing as heresy in general, neither can we conceive of any such thing as oppression in general. When men have been badly hurt they know where they are

hurt, but these people do not. I dismiss, as unworthy of further consideration, the sophism that the revolutionary war of 1776 presents any sort of parallel to this insurrection of the minority against the constitutional majority in 1861. And in discussing it let me add, of my own opinion, that the civil war of itself proves nothing against republican institutions, nor against the Federal constitution considered in itself. It only proves a very old truth, that social slavery cannot long co-exist undisturbed in the presence of political liberty.

Besides the military and diplomatic possibilities of disunion, we have also to consider the commercial interests involved. To show the extent to which our credit and prosperity depend upon that of our neighbours, I will give you, first the figures of what we sold to them for the four years ending with '54, the year the Reciprocity Treaty was negotiated, and next, what we sold to them in the four years ending with 1860:—

Four years ending 1854 . . .	\$27,081,887
Four years ending 1860 . . .	\$58,047,384

This increase from 27 to 58 millions of exports is, as you perceive, more than double, while there is this further consideration to be taken into the account, that whereas on the 27 millions the United States collected \$2,400,000 in duties—that is, taxed your industry to that extent in four years, on the 58 millions, if we are to believe Mr. Hatch, they have not collected in the four years ending in 1859—the latest figures in his report—the total sum of \$300,000. If, however, the Reciprocity Treaty has been beneficial to us, it has been no less so, in my opinion, to the Americans. We took from them in the four years ending 1860, goods and products to the value of \$70,000,000 and upwards. On these imports, we of course raised a very large share of our revenue—fully one-fourth of our whole revenue; but the Americans were not without their profits, and the custom duties fell, as they naturally must, on Canadian consumers. The value of our whole American commerce

in 1860 may be estimated in this way, that whereas the year's exports and imports amounted together to over \$69,000,000, our exports and imports to and from the United States summed up within a fraction of 38 out of those \$69,000,000. Our entire trade with Great Britain reached to but \$29,000,000, and with the rest of the world to about \$2,000,000. Now, gentlemen, this enormous trade may be injured, decreased, crippled, or even lost in various contingencies. It is a trade maintained with the Free States altogether; it may be injured by their defeats, by their embarrassments, by their onerous burthens in a long-continued war. It may be crippled, or even lost, through international estrangement, enmity, and a spirit of retaliation. I ask the farmers, the millers, the forwarders and lumberers of Upper Canada and Central Canada to think of this, when they see a portion of the press they patronise artfully and continually labouring to stir up hostility and hatred towards the Northern Americans. I venture to ask those journalists themselves to reflect upon the consequences to Canada of a refusal to continue the Reciprocity Treaty in 1865; to estimate the consequences, to count the cost, to ask themselves how many ploughs may rust in the farmyard, how many bushels may rot in the warehouse, how many mortgages may be foreclosed by the bank or the court; what stringency, what gloom, and what suffering, what permanent check to prosperity must be inflicted upon Canada and its people?

For all these reasons, commercial, diplomatic, military, and Christian, it must be to us a problem of the highest interest, whether this civil war is to be a long or a short one, and on which side the chances of victory may incline. We can only form our judgments as to the issue by comparing the character, the resources, and the situation of the combatants. If the knowledge of causes is prophetic of events, and if we could master the whole of any set of existing facts, we could, probably, construct history *à priori* for a generation or two after our own time. We must not, however, mistake the bravado articles of any particular press as an infallible index of Northern character, if we do

not wish to be self-deceived. The people of the North are 20,000,000; they are very generally educated, so far at least as to acquire and exchange the current information of the day. They are, men and women, all politicians, and now all Unionists. Their unanimity, though not so silent, is not less real than that of their Southern brethren. When I see men like Mr. Dickinson and Mr. Everett as warm in the support of Mr. Lincoln's administration as if they were members of his cabinet, I cannot doubt that the energies of the North are braced, that no man really essential is wanting. We are to remember, however, that this generation of Americans have hitherto had everything their own way—that since the Treaty of Ghent, forty years ago, their voyage of life has been all plain sailing. They have been born to prosperity and dandled in luxury and self-opinion. The first great adversity with such a people is hard to bear, but they bear it bravely, and will learn to bear it better. I may be reminded of their panic flight in the first battle; but what militia, what army, after all, has not been, at one time or another, smitten with panic? Not to mention modern instances, which might seem invidious, no one I suppose will question the courage of the Spaniards who followed Cortez into the city of Mexico; nor the courage of the legions who landed with Cæsar to restore Roman ascendancy in Egypt. Yet we know that a clamour raised by some sailors who had come up to witness the assault on Alexandria in the one case, and the breaking down of a causeway in the other, threw those Spanish and Roman veterans into panic flight, even under the eye, within the sound of the voice, of their illustrious captains. The North will fight; the North has the numbers two to one in its favour; its credit exceeds in proportion its numbers; it can command both "gold and iron," the two hinges on which all wars must move. The South, on the other hand, possesses in its peculiar social formation some advantages as a war-making power, which go a good way to make up for its deficiency in numbers and convertible wealth. It cherished in its colonial stage a tincture of feudal pride, which has not been entirely obliterated.

Ch. IV.

The spirit of caste is not uncongenial to the military spirit. So long as its 4,000,000 of bondsmen close their ears to the distant din of war, and labour as if the earth did not rock beneath their feet, the whites can spare a percentage to the army, equal to almost double their number at the North. A very large proportion of these whites are horsemen from their childhood, and as cavalry ought to be much superior to an equal number of Northern tradesmen or townsmen. In their unanimity, in their sense of discipline, in their gradations of ranks and classes, they possess some materials of military success which the North might envy. In their consciousness of superiority, sedulously cultivated, and unhesitatingly believed, they have another great element of success; for nothing is more certain than that undoubting belief is often the perfecter of its own prophecies. Yet the South, besides its inferiority in numbers and in realised wealth, has the fatal defect of its shallow shores without a first-class harbour from Norfolk to Galveston—a coast more easily blockaded than any other of the same extent with which we are acquainted. They are not by their position, nor by their discipline, a maritime people, and even if they succeed, they must be for ever dependant on some foreign maritime power. Yet with all these drawbacks they are an enemy not to be despised, and the war they wage will neither be a short war nor a weak war.

Whatever indirect advantage Canada or the Empire might derive from the war, the people of Canada can never be indifferent to the dangers to the system of free intercourse and common arbiter, which is to stand or fall in this encounter. It is not by feeding our minds with such paltry passions as have been sometimes appealed to, that we, the possessors of a seventh part of North America, are to shame our Republican neighbours out of their assaults upon ourselves. Our littleness is not to rebuke their littleness; we are not to answer railing with railing, nor to heap up wrath against the day of wrath. We can afford to speak of the American system in this hour of its agony, in the glowing language of their finest poet:

"Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!
We know what Master laid the keel,
What Workmen wrought thy ribs of steel,
Who made each mast, and sail, and rope;
What anvils rang, what hammers beat,
In what a forge and what a heat
Were shaped the anchors of thy hope."

We do not—to continue the poet's image—while the ship is driving on the rocks, her signal gun pealing for aid above the din of the tempest—we do not lurk along the shore, gloating over her danger, in hope of enriching ourselves by the wreck. No, God forbid! Such is not the feeling of the people of Canada. On the contrary, so far as their public opinion can be heard throughout the British Empire or the United States, their wish would be that the Republic, as it was twelve months ago, might live to celebrate in concord, in 1876, the centenary of its Independence. We prefer our own institutions to theirs; but our preference is rational, not rancorous; we may think, and we do think, it would have been well for them to have retained more than they did retain of the long-tried wisdom of their ancestors; we may think, and we do think, that their overthrow of ancient precedents and venerable safeguards was too sweeping in 1776; but as between continental peace and chronic civil war—as between natural right and oligarchical oppression; as between the constitutional majority and the lawless minority; as between free intercourse and armed frontiers; as between negro emancipation and a revival of the slave trade; as between the golden rule and the cotton crop of 1861; as between the revealed unity of the race and the heartless heresy of African bestiality; as between the North and South in this deplorable contest, I rest firmly in the belief, that all that is most liberal, most intelligent, and most magnanimous in Canada and the Empire, are for continental peace, for constitutional arbitrament, for universal, if gradual emancipa-

(2 p. 116)

tion, for free intercourse, for justice, mercy, civilisation, and the North.*

* Whoever has the patience to follow to the end this series of speeches and addresses will perceive that the strong pro-Northern sentiments of the speaker, so freely uttered in the doubtful and discouraging days of 1861, though never retracted, were repeated less frequently, and with several modifications, during the three succeeding years. This was a natural consequence of the tone taken towards Canada, and the Empire, by the organs of Northern opinion, especially after the affair of the *Trent*. It is to be hoped that the heartily friendly feeling which was expressed in this address, and so heartily applauded by a fair representation of the best men of Upper Canada, may be found capable of restoration, without any compromise of self-respect on the part of either people.

can. v.

AMERICAN RELATIONS AND CANADIAN DUTIES.

ADDRESS TO THE IRISH PROTESTANT BENEVOLENT SOCIETY, QUEBEC,
MAY 10TH, 1862.

MR. MCGEE said:—Ladies and Gentlemen, I received some time ago, a warm invitation from my friend, Captain Anderson, the Secretary of this Society, asking me to be present and take part in the proceedings of this evening. It was an invitation given with great cordiality, for an Irish society's benefit, and the object was to enable the society to assist the friendless emigrant, and the unfortunate resident. It seems to be incident to our state of society, where we have no legal provision for the poor, no organised system of relief of any public general kind, that there should be a division of charitable labour among our different voluntary societies,—and as I look upon them all, whether under the auspices of Saint Patrick or any other patron saint, as being themselves but members of one vast society—the society of Canada,—I did not feel that I could, either on Irish or on Canadian grounds, decline the invitation. It is very true, Mr. President, that you and I will not be found to-morrow worshipping under the same roof, but is that any reason why we should not be united here to-night in a common work of charity? With me it is no reason; such differences exist in the first elements of our population: and it is the duty of every man, especially of every man undergoing the education of a statesman, to endeavour to mitigate instead of inflaming, religious animosities. No prejudices lie nearer the surface than those which plead the sanction of religion—any idiot may arouse them, to the wise man's consternation, and the peaceful

D

man's deep regret. If in times past they have been too often and too easily aroused, we must all deeply deplore it; but for the future,—in these new and eventful days, when it is so essential that there shall be complete harmony within our ranks,—let us all agree to brand the propagandist of bigotry as the most dangerous of our enemies, because his work is to divide us among ourselves, and thereby render us incapable of common defence. It is upon this subject of the public spirit to be cultivated among us—of the spirit which can alone make Canada safe and secure, rich and renowned—which can alone attract population and augment capital—that I desire to say the few words with which I must endeavour to fulfil your expectations. I feel that it is a serious subject for a popular festival—but these are serious times, and they bring upon their wings most serious reflections. That shot fired at Fort Sumter, on the 13th of April, 1861, had a message for the North as well as for the South, and here in Quebec, if anywhere, by the light which history lends us we, should find those who can rightly read that eventful message. Here, from this rock, for which the immortals have contended, here from this rock, over which Richelieu's wisdom and Chatham's genius, and the memory of heroic men, the glory of three great Nations has hung its halo, we should look forth upon a continent convulsed, and ask of a ruler, "Watchman, what of the night?" That shot fired at Fort Sumter was the signal gun of a new epoch for North America, which told the people of Canada more plainly than human speech can ever express it, to sleep no more, except on their arms—unless in their sleep they desire to be overtaken and subjugated. For one, Mr. President, I can safely say that if I know myself I have not a particle of prejudice against the United States; on the contrary, I am bound to declare that many things in the constitution and the people I sincerely esteem and admire. What I contend for with myself, and what I would impress upon others is, that the lesson of the last few months furnished by America to the world, should not be thrown away upon the inhabitants of Canada. I do not believe that it is our

ADDRESSES ON VARIOUS PUBLIC OCCASIONS. 35

destiny to be engulfed into a Republican union, renovated and inflamed with the wine of victory, of which she now drinks so freely—it seems to me we have theatre enough under our feet to act another and a worthier part; we can hardly join the Americans on our own terms, and we never ought to join them on theirs. A Canadian nationality, not French-Canadian, nor British-Canadian, nor Irish-Canadian—patriotism rejects the prefix—is, in my opinion, what we should look forward to,—that is what we ought to labour for, that is what we ought to be prepared to defend to the death. Heirs of one-seventh of the continent—inheritors of a long ancestral story,—and no part of it dearer to us than the glorious tale of this last century,—warned not by cold chronicles only, but by living scenes, passing before our eyes, of the dangers of an unmixed democracy,—we are here to vindicate our capacity, by the test of a new political creation. What we most immediately want, Mr. President, to carry on that work, is men—more men—and still more men! The ladies, I dare say, will not object to that doctrine. We may not want more lawyers and doctors—but we want more men, in town and country. We want the signs of youth and growth in our young and growing country. One of our maxims should be—"early marriages, and death to old bachelors." I have long entertained a project of a special tax upon that most undesirable class of the population, and our friend the Finance Minister may perhaps have something of the kind among the agreeable surprises of his next budget. Seriously, Mr. President, what I chiefly wanted to say in coming here is this, that if we would make Canada safe and secure, rich and renowned, we must all liberalise—locally, sectionally, religiously, nationally. There is room enough in this country for one great free people, but there is not room enough, under the same flag, and the same laws, for two or three angry, suspicious, obstructive "nationalities." Dear, most justly dear to every land beneath the sun are the children born in her bosom, and nursed upon her breast; but when the man of another country, wherever born, speaking whatever speech, holding whatever creed, seeks out a country to

serve and honour and cleave to, in weal or in woe,—when he heaves up the anchor of his heart from its old moorings, and lays at the feet of the mistress of his choice, his New country, all the hopes of his ripe manhood, he establishes by such devotion a claim to consideration, not second even to that of the children of the soil. — He is their brother delivered by a new birth from the dark-wombed Atlantic ship that ushers him into existence in the new world,—he stands by his own election among the children of the household, and narrow and most unwise is that species of public spirit, which, in the perverted name of patriotism, would refuse him all he asks—“a fair field and no favour.” I am not about to talk politics, Mr. President, though these are grand politics—I reserve all else for what is usually called “another place”;—and I may add, for another time. But I am so thoroughly convinced and assured that we are gliding along the currents of a new epoch, that if I break silence at all, in the presence of my fellow-subjects, I cannot choose but speak of the immense issues which devolve upon us, at this moment, in this country. I may be pardoned, perhaps, if I refer to another matter that comes home to you, Mr. President, and to myself. Though we are alike opposed to all invidious national distinctions on this soil, we are not opposed, I hope, to giving full credit to all the elements which at the present day compose our population. In this respect it is a source of gratification to learn that among your invited guests, to-night, there are twelve or thirteen members of the House to which I have the honour to belong—gentlemen from both sides of the House—who drew their native breath in our own dearly beloved ancestral island. It takes three quarters of the world in these days to hold an Irish family, and it is pleasant to know that some of the elder sons of the family are considered, by their discriminating fellow-citizens, worthy to be entrusted with the liberties and fortunes of their adopted countries. We have here men of Irish birth who have led, and who still lead, the Parliament of Canada, and who are determined to lead it in a spirit of genuine liberality. We, Irishmen, Pro-

testant and Catholic, born and bred in a land of religious controversy, should never forget that we now live and act in a land of the fullest religious and civil liberty. All we have to do, is, each for himself, to keep down dissensions which can only weaken, impoverish, and keep back the country; each for himself do all he can to increase its wealth, its strength, and its reputation; each for himself—you and you, gentlemen, and all of us—to welcome every talent, to hail every invention, to cherish every gem of art, to foster every gleam of authorship, to honour every acquirement and every natural gift, to lift ourselves to the level of our destinies, to rise above all low limitations and narrow circumscriptions, to cultivate that true catholicity of spirit which embraces all creeds, all classes, and all races, in order to make of our boundless Province, so rich in known and unknown resources, a great new Northern nation.

Cap. VI.

BRITISH-AMERICAN UNION.

SPEECH AT A POLITICAL PIC-NIC AT PORT ROBINSON, CANADA WEST,
SEPTEMBER 18TH, 1862.

HON. MR. MCGEE said he had listened with great pleasure to the statesmanlike, national, broad-principled, and high-spirited speech of the Premier of Nova Scotia, (Mr. Howe), and he had heard the fervent, animated, and manly sentiments expressed by his hon. friend, Mr. Mitchell, of New Brunswick, with almost equal pleasure. For his own part he had never been a sectional man. He had no sectional partialities in this country. He was neither a Lower Canadian nor an Upper Canadian. In the Government, or out of the Government, he had never known what the old Province line was. The Province line was obliterated before he came to the country, and never should be restored with his consent. And not being a sectional man as regarded Canada, he was not a sectional man as regarded British America; for if, in the progress of events, we could draw together more closely, in the presence of the perilous circumstances that confronted us on our Southern frontier, the bonds of amity and union with our British brethren who dwelt on the shores of the Atlantic, he, for his part, was ready to bid Godspeed to the Union, and to take his share of the responsibility of bringing it about. The last great act of union that was accomplished on this continent of British America, was accomplished amidst great difficulties, and as it appeared to him very hastily in some of its details, and it had worked in some respects not to the satisfaction of the people either of Upper or Lower Canada. But still that Act of Union of 1840 was a step in the right direction, one step forward in

the great pathway which Providence seemed to have prescribed to the British people of the northern portion of this continent. And now, looking back at it, he did not think there was a public man of any party, with any pretension to information or influence in Canadian affairs, who would be prepared to go back to the state of things which existed before that Union. As that Union of 1840, therefore, was a step in the right direction, so he believed that, in the fulness of time and of events, a greater union than that would come, and that all the people of the north, bred and nursed under the system of local freedom, under the shadow and protection of the three-crossed flag, would come together in a close union, having learned wisdom from the example of our brethren across the border, whose schism he deplored, and the fruits of which were unhappily seen to day on the field of battle, gathered with the sickle that gathers the crop of death. These results we could not rejoice over, but the example we might profit by. And if we were to be an independent people—which, however, he did not at all apprehend to be probable as an immediate contingency—let us be an independent people with a seaboard as well as an inland country. If we were to be an Imperial people, which he thought was at present our position, let us continue an Imperial people, but not to be an Imperial puppet, to be petted at one moment, and stigmatized before the world at another. Let us not be kept for the convenience of Imperial Senators, as Scott tells us Mungo Malagrowther was kept in the Scottish Court, to be whipped in the place of the young Prince, to show what he ought to have got when he was naughty, because it would have been unconstitutional to have touched any portion of his Royal Highness's person with a rod. It would appear that when it devolved upon the Empire to subdue the spirit of party at home, the object was sometimes aimed at by administering a whipping to some of its colonial possessions, and that the same thing was resorted to when it was sought to make an impression for some purpose or other on the Government of the Northern States at Washington. These colonies ought not to submit

to such treatment. Let them say to the people of the mother country, We are willing to bear our share, with you and all portions of her Majesty's subjects, in the anxieties and perils and dangers of the Empire, but insult and opprobrium we will not take from your hands. He was glad to hear the broad national sentiments to which they had just listened, and he heartily echoed them as one of the representatives of the people of this Province. He thanked his friends from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for their kindness in coming there to give them, at this critical period in their history, the benefit of those sentiments. And he knew little of public opinion in the British Empire, if before this day six weeks these words, uttered on the Welland, did not meet the eye of every leading statesman of England, whether in or out of the Government. He did not know that, viewed in this light, there had been any public meeting of more importance during the time he had been a resident of Canada. He was glad also to hear the testimony which had been paid to the worth of the late representative of this Division, the Hon. Hamilton Merritt. He could not utter a better wish for his hon. friend beside him (Mr. Currie), than that he might prove himself a worthy successor of the enterprising, clear-headed, laborious old man, whose place he was about to take in the Legislative Council. Mr. Merritt, like all other human beings, might have had defects in his character, but there was one defect which certainly he had not. He had neither a small heart nor a small head. Nature did not make him on a small block, and he made good use of the large quantity of good stuff that went originally to his composition. As long as the Welland Canal connects Lakes Erie and Ontario, as long as Niagara Suspension Bridge remains a monument of engineering skill, so long will the name of Hamilton Merritt continue inseparably associated with Western enterprise. But he was not simply a western Canadian; he was a North American. He was an American by birth, but in Mr. Merritt's active days, the people of Canada were not badly-bitten with the mania of anti-Americanism. If not

any more American then than now, we did not go rabid against any one whose birthplace was on the other side of the lakes. It was not in the Niagara District alone that Mr. Merritt was interested. He was as much interested in the prosperity of the port of Quebec as in that of Toronto, or St. Catherine's, or either of the termini of the canal. He saw, as every man of far vision saw, that whatever benefited one part of our common country, must ultimately benefit every part of it; and he could only wish that the new member for the Niagara Division, in assisting in the future legislation of Canada, would approach all questions of commercial intercourse and internal improvement with as large and liberal a spirit as his venerated predecessor had done. It had been said that last year they had had a meeting of condolence, and that this year they had a meeting of congratulation, an important change having taken place in the affairs of this Province in the meantime. He would not, at a gathering of this description, go into questions of party politics, but he would say he believed there had been a most important change effected. After some allusions to recent ministerial changes, Mr. McGee next referred to the rejected Militia Bill of the late Government, and said it was not without considerable difficulty that he had voted against its second reading, bad as many of its details were. He believed it necessary that there should be a certain amount of arms and ammunition in the hands of our own people for the protection of our frontier—not against a national invasion,—against that we must have other remedies—but against marauding bands, who might disturb the peace of our frontier, on the disbanding of the present large standing army of the United States. But, unfortunately for our neighbours, there appeared little likelihood of that disbanding for some time to come. The struggle was, on both sides, he regretted to see, when it was people speaking our own language who were engaged in it, assuming the character of a war of extermination. His own sympathies had been and still were with the North, as the legitimate Government. But no wise people would trust to the forbearance of its neighbours as

the safeguard of its liberties, and Parliament did well, as matters stood last spring, in voting the sum it did to supplement the defences of the Province in aid of the effort of the Imperial Government. He was also quite willing to aid in the construction of such facilities of communication as would give the British Government free ingress into this territory at all seasons of the year, or to do any other reasonable thing that would give satisfaction to the reasonable feeling of England, and at the same time not beggar and bankrupt the people of Canada. Like Falstaff, he would do nothing upon compulsion, he would not be driven into any course by those speeches in the House of Lords to which reference had been made by Mr. Howe; but it was our interest as well as our duty to do everything we could to satisfy the people of England that we were ready to bear our reasonable share of the burden of the defence of the Province. This position he would have illustrated by his vote last spring, had he been in the House, and he would be prepared to illustrate it again in the coming session of Parliament. The Government, in providing for the defence of the country, were prepared to go to the limit of their ability, and the limit of their ability was the measure of their responsibility. Mr. McGee then referred to the signs of wealth and abundance among the farmers which had met his eye in travelling through the country, and made an eloquent appeal that some portion of that abundance should be sent for the relief of the suffering operatives in the manufacturing districts of England. Such an act on the part of Canadians would be the best reply they could give to the accusations which had been recently made in England against them.

(22. VIII.

CHARACTER OF CHAMPLAIN, THE FIRST CAPTAIN-
GENERAL OF CANADA :
THE FRENCH-CANADIANS UNDER FRANCE AND
GREAT BRITAIN.

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED AT FORT POPHAM, STATE OF MAINE, 29TH
SEPTEMBER, 1862.*

The memory of Sieur de Champlain, the fearless navigator and accomplished statesman ; the first to explore and designate these shores ; whose plans of Empire, more vast and sagacious than any of his time, failed of success only through the short-sightedness of his sovereign, in allowing the Atlantic shores of New England to fall into the hands of his rivals, thereby changing the history of the New World.

HON. MR. MCGEE, President of the Executive Council of Canada, addressed the assemblage in response to this sentiment. He said: I beg to assure you, Mr. President, and the gentlemen of the Maine Historical Society, who have done me the honour to invite me here, that I feel it a very great privilege to be a spectator and a participant in the instructive, retributive ceremonial of this day. This peninsula of Sabino must become, if it is not now, classic ground ; and this 29th of August, the true era of the establishment of our language and race on this continent, one of the most cherished *fasti* of the English-speaking people of North America. It is, on general grounds, an occasion hardly less interesting to the colonies still English, than to the citizens of Maine, and, therefore, I beg to repeat in your presence the gratification I feel in being

* This was the commencement of an interesting series of annual celebrations, observed with great *éclat*, of the foundation of "the first colony on the shores of New England." The place is the peninsula of Sabino, at the mouth of the Kennebeck river ; the founder was Captain George Popham, brother of Chief Justice Popham, and the time 19th of August (old style), 1607.

allowed to join in the first, of what I trust will prove but the first, of an interminable series of such celebrations. I would be very insensible, Sir, to the character in which I have been so cordially presented to this assembly, if I did not personally acknowledge it; and I should be, I conceive, unworthy the position I happen to occupy as a member of the Canadian Government, if I did not feel still more the honour you have paid to Canada, in the remembrance you have made of her first Governor and Captain-General, the *Sieur de Champlain*. That celebrated person was in truth, not only in point of time, but in the comprehension of his views, the audacity of his projects, and the celebrity of his individual career, the first statesman of Canada; and no one pretending to the character of a Canadian statesman could feel otherwise than honoured and gratified, when *Champlain's* name is invoked, publicly or privately, in his presence. We have no fear that the reputation of our great Founder will not stand the severest test of historical research; we have no fear that his true greatness will dwindle by comparison with the rest of the Atlantic leaders—the chiefs of the renowned sea-chivalry, of whom we have already heard such eloquent mention. All Canadians ardently desire that he should be better known—be well known—and perhaps, Mr. President, you will permit me to indicate some of the traits in the career, to point to some of the traits in the character, which halo for us for ever the name and memory of the *Sieur de Champlain*.

What we esteem most of all other features in the life of our Founder, is that chief virtue of all eminent men—his indomitable fortitude; and next to that we revere the amazing versatility and resources of the man. Originally a naval officer, he had voyaged to the West Indies and to Mexico, and had written a memoir, lately discovered at Dieppe, and edited both in France and England, advocating among other things the artificial connection of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. From the quarter-deck we trace him to the counting-rooms of the merchants of Rouen and Saint Malo, who first entrusted him in 1603, with the command of a commercial enterprise of which Canada was the field.

From the service of the merchants of Rouen, Dieppe, and Saint Malo, we trace him to the service of his Sovereign—Henry IV. For several successive years we find his flag glancing at all points along this rock-bound coast on which we are now assembled, from Port Royal to Massachusetts Bay. Whenever we do not find it here, we may be certain it has advanced into the interior, that it is unfurled at Quebec, at Montreal, or towards the sources of the Hudson and the Mohawk. We will find that this versatile sailor has become in time a founder of cities, a negotiator of treaties with barbarous tribes, an author, a discoverer. As a discoverer, he was the first European to ascend the Richelieu, which he named after the patron of his latter years—the all-powerful Cardinal. He was the first to traverse that beautiful lake, now altogether your own, which makes his name so familiar to Americans; he was the first to ascend our great central river, the Ottawa, as far north as Lake Nippising, and he was the first to discover what he very justly calls “the fresh-water sea” of Lake Ontario. His place as an American discoverer is, therefore, amongst the first; while his claims as a coloniser rest on the firm foundations of Montreal and Quebec, and his project—extraordinary for the age—of uniting the Atlantic with the Pacific by an artificial channel of communication. As a legislator, we have not yet recovered, if we ever shall recover, the ordinances he is known to have promulgated; but as an author we have his narrative of transactions in New France, his voyage to Mexico, his treatise on navigation, and some other papers. As a diplomatist we have the Franco-Indian alliances, which he founded, and which lasted a hundred and fifty years on this continent, and which exercised so powerful an influence, not only on American but on European affairs. To him also it was mainly owing that Canada, Acadia, and Cape Breton were reclaimed by, and restored to France under the treaty of Saint Germain-en-Laye, in 1632. As to the moral qualities, our Founder was brave almost to rashness. He would cast himself with a single European follower in the midst of savage enemies, and more than once his life

was endangered by the excess of his confidence and his courage. He was eminently social in his habits—as his order of *le bon temps*—in which every man of his associates was for one day host to all his comrades, and commanded in turn in those agreeable encounters of which we have just had a slight skirmish here. He was sanguine as became an adventurer, and self-denying as became a hero. He served under De Monts, who for a time succeeded to his honours and office, as cheerfully as he had ever acted for himself, and in the end he made a friend of his rival. He encountered, as Columbus and many others had done, mutiny and impatience in his own followers, but he triumphed over the bad passions of men as completely as he triumphed over the ocean and the wilderness.

He touched the extremes of human experience among diverse characters and nations. At one time he sketched plans of civilised aggrandisement for Henry IV. and Richelieu; at another, he planned schemes of wild warfare with Huron chiefs and Algonquin braves. He united, in a most rare degree, the faculties of action and reflection, and like all highly reflective minds, his thoughts, long cherished in secret, ran often into the mould of maxims, and some of them would form the fittest possible inscriptions to be engraven upon his monument.

When the merchants of Quebec grumbled at the cost of fortifying that place, he said:—"It is best not to obey the passions of men; they are but for a season; it is our duty to regard the future." With all his love of good-fellowship and society, he was, what seems to some inconsistent with it, sincerely and enthusiastically religious; among his maxims are these two—that "The salvation of one soul is of more value than the conquest of an empire," and, that "Kings ought not to think of extending their authority over idolatrous nations, except for the purpose of subjecting them to Jesus Christ."

Such, Mr. President, are, in brief, the attributes of the man you have chosen to honour; and I leave it for this company to say, whether in all that constitutes true greatness the first Governor and Captain-General of Canada

need fear comparison with any of the illustrious brotherhood who projected and founded our North American States. Count over all their honoured names; enumerate their chief actions; let each community assign to its own his meed of eloquent and reverent remembrance; but among them, from North to South, there will be no secondary place assigned to the Sieur de Champlain.

Mr. President, you have added to the sentiment in honour of Champlain, an allusion and an inference as to the different results of the French and English colonial policy, on which you will probably expect me to offer an observation or two before resuming my seat. Champlain's project originally was, no doubt, to make this Atlantic coast the basis of French power in the New World. His Government claimed the continent down to the 40th parallel, which, as you know, intersects Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois, while the English claimed up to the 45th, which intersects Nova Scotia and Canada.

Within these five degrees of latitude the pretensions of France were long zealously maintained in diplomacy, but were never practically asserted, except in the 44th and 45th, by colonisation. I am not prepared to dispute the inference that the practical abandonment, by France, of the coast discoveries of her early navigators, south of 45, may have changed, as you say, "the destiny of the New World." It may be so; it may be, also, that we have not reached the point of time in which to speak positively as to the permanent result; for Divine Providence moves in His orbit by long and insensible curves, of which even the clearest-sighted men can discern in their time but a very limited section. But we know, as of the past, that the French power in the reign of Louis XIII. and XIV. was practically based on the St. Lawrence, with a Southern aspect, rather than on the Atlantic, with a Western aspect. All the consequences of this change of Champlain's plan and policy I am not prepared here so much as to allude to, for that would carry me where I have no wish to go—into international issues, not yet exhausted.

I may be permitted, however, to question that French

influence, as developed in its Roman Catholic religion, its Roman law and its historical fascinations, was ever really circumscribed to Canada, or was really extinguished, as has been usually assumed, by the fall of Quebec. It is amazing to find in the Colonial records of the period between the death of Champlain and the death of Montcalm, a century and a quarter, how important a part that handful of secluded French colonists played in North American affairs. In 1629, Champlain could have carried off all his colonists in "a single ship"; more than a hundred years later they were estimated at some 65,000 souls; in the Seven Years' War they were, according to Mr. Bancroft, but as "one to fourteen" of the English colonists. The part played by the Canadians in war, under the French Kings, was out of all proportion to their numbers; it was a brilliant but prodigal part; it left their country exposed to periodical scarcity, without wealth, without commerce, without political liberty. They were ruled by a policy strictly martial to the very last, and though Richelieu, Colbert, De la Gallissionière, and other supreme minds saw, in their "New France," great commercial capabilities, the prevailing policy, especially under Louis XIV. and XV., was to make and keep Canada a mere military colony. It is instructive to find a man of such high intelligence as Montcalm justifying that policy in his despatches to the President de Mole on the very eve of the surrender of Quebec. The Canadians, in his opinion, ought not to be allowed to manufacture, lest they should become unmanageable like the English colonists, but, on the contrary, they should be kept to martial exercises, that they might subserve the interests of France in her Transatlantic wars with England. Such was the policy which fell at Quebec with its last French Governor and Captain-General; a policy, I need hardly say, which no intelligent Canadian now looks back to with any other feelings than those of regret and disapprobation. A hundred years have elapsed since the international contest to which you refer was consummated at Quebec, and Canada to-day, under the mild and equitable sway of her fourth English sovereign, has to point to trophies of

peaceful progress, not less glorious, and far more serviceable, than any achieved by our predecessors who were subjects to the French kings. The French-speaking population, which from 1608 till 1760 had not reached 100,000, from 1750 to 1860 has multiplied to 880,000. Upper Canada, a wilderness as Champlain found it and Montcalm left it, has a population exceeding Massachusetts, of as fine a yeomanry as ever stirred the soil of the earth. If French Canada points with justifiable pride to its ancient battlefield, English Canada points with no less pleasure to its newly-reclaimed harvest fields; if the old *régime* is typified by the strong walls of Quebec, the monument of the new era may be seen in the great bridge which spans the St. Lawrence within view of the city I represent, and whose four and twenty piers may each stand for one hour sacred to every traveller who steams through its sounding tube on his way from the Atlantic to the far West.

In conclusion, Mr. President, allow me again to assure you that I have listened with great pleasure to the speeches of this day—especially to the address of my old and esteemed friend (Hon. Mr. Poor). I trust the sentiments uttered here, at the mouth of the Kennebec, in Maine, will go home to England, and show our English relatives that the American people, unmoved by any selfish motive, are capable of doing full and entire justice to the best qualities of the English character. I am sure nothing was farther from your minds than to turn this historical commemoration to any political account—and certainly I could not have done myself the pleasure of being here if I had imagined any such intention. But after all the angry taunts which have been lately exchanged between England and America, I cannot but think this solemn acknowledgment of national affiliation, made on so memorable a spot as Fort Popham, and made in so cordial a spirit, must have a healing and a happy effect. We have been sitting under your authority, Mr. President, in the High Court of Posterity—we have summoned our ancestors from their ancient graves—we have dealt out praise and blame among them—I trust without violence to truth or injustice to the

Dead: for the dead have their rights as the living have: injustice to them is one of the worst forms of all injustice, and undue praise to the undeserving is the worst injustice to the virtuous and meritorious actors in the great events of former ages.

When we leave this place we shall descend from the meditative world of the Past to mingle in the active world of the Present, where each man must bear his part and defend his post. Let me say for myself, Mr. President, and I think I may add I speak in this respect the general settled sentiment of my countrymen of Canada, when I say that in the extraordinary circumstances which have arisen for you, and for us also, in North America, there is no other feeling in Canada than a feeling of deep and sincere sympathy and friendliness towards the United States. As men loyal to our own institutions, we honour loyalty everywhere; as freemen we are interested in all free States; as neighbours we are especially interested in your peace, prosperity, and welfare. We are all anxious to exchange everything with you except injustice and misrepresentation; that is a species of commerce which—even when followed by the fourth estate (pointing to the reporters at his right)—I trust we will alike discourage, even to the verge of prohibition. Not only as a Canadian, but as one who was originally an emigrant to these shores as an Irishman, with so many of my original countrymen resident among you, I shall never cease to pray that this kindred people may always find in the future, as they always have found in the past, brave men to lead them in battle, wise men to guide them in council, and eloquent men like my honourable friend yonder (Hon. John A. Poor), to celebrate their exploits and their wisdom from generation to generation.

Cap VIII.

OTTAWA, THE PROBABLE CAPITAL OF AN
UNITED BRITISH AMERICA.

REPLY TO A TOAST AT A COMPLIMENTARY SUPPER GIVEN BY THE SAINT
PATRICK'S LITERARY SOCIETY OF OTTAWA, OCTOBER 14TH, 1862.

MR. MCGEE, after a few introductory remarks, of a personal nature, said:—And now you will no doubt expect me to allude briefly to some other subjects in which the people of Canada and the citizens of Ottawa are more deeply interested than in the *personnel* of the Administration. I suppose you would like to hear my frank opinion on the subject of the Government Buildings in this city. Well, gentlemen, I was one of the last to admit the propriety of reference which was made on that subject; but having admitted and adopted that decision as part of the policy of the present Administration—having done so in perfect good faith, without any ulterior views whatever—I would be the last to consent to reopen the question. Ottawa was not my choice, but it has been selected by Her Majesty, that decision has been frankly adopted by the present Government, and it will be frankly and fully carried out. There is only one remote possibility of disturbing that decision, and that might follow if the members for Ottawa constituencies allowed themselves to be made use of by any party combination. If they allowed the Ottawa question to be made use of as a party question, they might drive others to reopen the question; but unless it is revived by some such error as that—and it is your interest to see that no such error is committed by your representatives—Ottawa may rely upon it that the present Administration will never go back of their word. Yes, gentlemen, not only may your city become the Seat of

Government of Canada, if your interests are properly represented, but in after times of all British America, between the Rocky Mountains and the Atlantic Ocean. I suppose you have all seen in the public journals a good deal of discussion as to the late Intercolonial Conference at Quebec, and a projected Intercolonial railway. Well, gentlemen, all I can tell you on that head is that that newspaper discussion must necessarily be premature, because no man at this moment, in any of the Colonies, or in England, can possibly say what precise shape that project may ultimately take—what route may be chosen—what distances involved—on what terms—under what conditions—subject to what management—that road will be made, if it is made, within a few years. The discussion must be premature, because the project is inchoate—because the negotiation has merely taken its first preliminary form—because, as a negotiation, it can only be matured in London, by and with the consent of the Imperial authorities. Those who desire to avoid rash conclusions and needless retractions will suspend their judgments till the project has matured and received its last form from negotiation, and then if it can be shown to be necessary to strengthen the connection with the mother country—if it can be shown to be necessary to our self-preservation as a British American people—if the liability can be limited, and the proportions fairly adjusted—I, for one, would not shrink from going to the people of Canada, from end to end of the Province, with this test question: “You think the connection valuable to Canada; what will you pay for it?” Is it worth to you five-twelfths of an iron road four hundred miles long? Is it worth the outlay on an additional link of railway of the distance, say from Montreal to Kingston, or thereabouts? For, gentlemen, depend upon it, we cannot in the North America of our day—in this new American age which announces its advent with salvos of artillery—we cannot go on as we have gone on in the piping times of peace. We have three choices before us: either to continue the Connection, or to set up for ourselves, or to drift into annexation with the Northern Democracy. Not one per cent. of the people of Canada at

present desire annexation; not one per cent. of the people feel that the hour has come for our entering on an independent political existence; and, therefore, practically the only choice left us is to provide for the proper maintenance, on our side, of the Imperial connection. I say frankly I place this alternative on no impalpable ground; but I do place it on the clear ground of common sense, of self-interest, of self-preservation, as well as on the sense of duty and conscientious obligation. I put it to you on Canadian, rather than on Imperial ground. I say the connection is worth paying for, and the only questions are, whether as to a militia or a military road, what can you pay, and when, and how, will you pay it? But, gentlemen, I do not rest our railroad connection with the Lower Provinces on military reasons only; there are political reasons, and there are commercial reasons as well. As to the commercial reasons, the three Provinces are fully committed to the principle of inter-colonial free trade, which would bring us 800,000 more customers, and if we should unfortunately lose the Reciprocity Treaty in 1865, would give Upper Canada a breadstuffs market, which takes as much from the United States now, as the United States do from Canada. As to the intrinsic value of the new country to be opened, I have the authority of a gentleman whose ability to judge cannot be questioned in Canada—Mr. Walter Shanly—who has been over the ground this last summer, and made very full notes of his tour, that with the exception of a belt of some 30 miles on the immediate border of Canada and New Brunswick, the remainder is generally as fine a country as any in North America. And this eastern enterprise may very fairly be looked upon as an additional motive and guarantee for western extension to the Pacific. Before I had a seat in Parliament, in this very city, several years ago, in speaking of the "Future of Canada," I expressed the same views I do now, when I say that the route by Lake Huron and Lake Superior to British Central America—to the prairie country too long monopolized by the 268 stockholders of the Hudson's Bay Company,—to that country rich in hides, in furs, in tallow, in salt, and in

mineral wealth—and rich, too, in agricultural capabilities—ought to be opened up, and must lead westward through the Ottawa valley. But we can hardly have the aid of a British ministry or of British capital for Western extension, if we underprice the connection, or refuse to begin at that end of it which lies next to England, and is more immediately required to maintain the connection. As to the general political reasons for the railroad, I think they will be found to be, on further observation, gentlemen, of the utmost weight, deserving the most careful consideration from the people of Canada. We are, for fully five months in the year, as much “an inland kingdom,” as that Bohemia whose castles, even Corporal Trim was forced to admit, “could not stand by the sea unless God willed it.” We now get to and from the Atlantic, five months in every year, by the grace and favour of the State of Maine; but unless Maine were at some future day to join us politically, that relation between us cannot be counted on, from year to year. Let us reason by experience, and see what has been the condition of other inland states of which we know something, on the continent of Europe. Take the two most conspicuous examples, the two great German powers Austria and Prussia. Why does Austria hold on so tenaciously to her Italian provinces? Because it is only through them she touches the sea. It is only through Venice, Trieste, and Fiume, that Austria exists as a maritime or commercial power; and though I do not know what it cost to construct the railway from Vienna to Trieste, through a very difficult country, I know well what lesson that road ought to teach us. It teaches the lesson of empire, in which Austrian statesmen have not seldom been the teachers of older states than ours. Look again at Prussia in the Baltic. What has been her expenditure between Berlin and Dantzic? Why does she at this moment vote 12,000,000 francs for Jahl, and 25,000,000 francs for Jashmund, in the isle of Rugen? To have outlets to the sea, through her own territory, to secure safe ports, to have her own avenues into the common exchange of all nations—the open ocean. Now, whether the British connection is to

outlast this century or the next, I cannot, as a Canadian representative, observant of the signs of the times, and our present peculiar circumstances, be any party to refusing for this country a sea-coast and outports—if they do not cost too much—which any civilised inland power in the world would give the lives of armies and millions of treasure to secure. I would stand rebuked and dumb in the presence of the Austrian and the Prussian if I were capable of such folly; it would be a stolid policy, more worthy of the dark interior of Africa, than of this region of acute and ready mental resources. I know it is said, the motto of our government is and ought to be, the one word, “Retrenchment!” Gentlemen, that is an excellent word—*Retrenchment*—but I will follow it with another, not hostile, not inconsistent with it, the word *Development*. Retrenchment is the immediate duty, the duty of the day and the hour,—but a government must lead as well as save, it must march as well as fortify, it must originate plans for the future, as well as correct the errors of the past. The eventful opportunity for British America is now; the tide in our affairs is at the flood, we must act as well as examine, advance as well as retrench. It is for us to appropriate the olive branch of peaceful progress, which the great Republic has relinquished for the blood-stained laurel; it is for us to unite the Atlantic and the Pacific, and to lay broad and deep on this soil the foundations of a thoroughly constitutional government. I see here many of the young men of the city and neighbourhood, and to the young men of British North America I look with every hope that they will sustain and maintain the programme of national development in connection with Great Britain, which it is the aim of my colleagues to inaugurate. The future belongs to them, and they belong to their successors; if a generous far-sighted British American policy is to triumph in Canada and the sister Provinces, the young men must be up and doing; if they will follow, I venture to promise they shall have a lead—a lead which will make Canada a great country, and Ottawa the capital of a United British America.

THE COMMON INTERESTS OF BRITISH NORTH AMERICA.

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE TEMPERANCE HALL, HALIFAX, NOVA
SCOTIA, JULY 21ST, 1863.

HON. MR. MCGEE said :—Mr. Mayor, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—This meeting has grown out of a very simple circumstance—the desire of several gentlemen, some of them very old friends, to hear from a Canadian representative what was generally thought in his province, as well as what views he himself took, on the subject of the long-talked-of Intercolonial Railway. The invitation was conveyed to me in the kindest terms, by gentlemen for whom I have the highest respect; but it would be folly in me to conceal that I felt a great deal of diffidence as to my own power to meet their expectations. I felt it not only from the nature of the subject to be spoken of—whose very magnitude was embarrassing—but also somewhat on personal grounds, as to what might be right and proper for me, as a Canadian representative, to say; but I nerved myself by saying, “If we can have no other direct intercourse, either of trade or travel, with our fellow-citizens of Nova Scotia at present, at all events let us have the intercourse of free speech and courteous personal consultation.” I propose, then, to submit to you the views, so far as I understand them, of very many in Canada, on the subject of this projected Colonial connection, with some remarks on the same subject which, perhaps, are more personal to myself. We are of opinion, very many of us, in the first place, that we cannot go on much longer—not many months perhaps, not many seasons certainly—as we have been in the past. Great necessities have arisen within the present decade, both on this and the

other side of the Atlantic, which seem to say to us, in Canada, and to all British America, "Look well to yourselves; consider carefully the times that now are; observe well that these are not the times of old; take counsel of your new Present as to how you may best confront your new Future." We may, ladies and gentlemen, be all wrong in thus translating into words the signs of our times, but with this warning voice ringing hourly in my ears, I cannot, for one, keep my eyes fixed only on local or sectional objects; nor shall I to-night treat the great subject you have called on me to discuss, in any local, or sectional, or one-province spirit. I should feel ashamed of myself if I were capable of mingling in the discussion of a subject of this description, anything—the least tinge—of the partisan; neither, I am quite sure, would you receive my arguments, if I were to calculate them exactly for the meridian of Halifax. Moreover, I feel that I must speak of, as well as to, British America,—that the free press of Nova Scotia will carry what I may say to the free press of Canada,—and that the voice raised here to-night on behalf of Colonial unity, feeble as it is, will be audible, within a month, to the farthest western settler who hears the wolf bark by night beyond Lake Huron. Now, what, in outline, is this British America of which we speak? We are four millions of nominal British subjects dotted over a seventh part of the continent. I say nominal British subjects, for we enjoy within ourselves absolute self-government, with an indefinite and sentimental, rather than a practical or onerous allegiance, to a distant, non-resident sovereign.

It is to be allowed, however, that there are two exceptions to this state of absolute self-government—the autocratic power of the Government of British Columbia,* and the close oligarchy of the Hudson's Bay. And, as if to show how thoroughly the rights of the Crown are assumed to be extinguished in the soil of all these immense regions, we learn, only within a week, that that Hudson's Bay Com-

* This complaint, perhaps overstated at the time, has since been remedied.

British Government colony.

pany have actually sold the proprietorship (and received the pretty luck-penny of £100,000 down) of somewhere about 500,000 square miles of Her Majesty's dominions in North America, which the sellers pretend to hold in fee by a title derived from King Charles II. Distant as that territory is from us, far in the future as its ultimate destinies may repose, I am sure the Imperial Government will have something to say about its sale, and that we in Canada will have something to say about its delivery. I know nothing but what has been stated in the newspapers as to this sale, but I instance it here, at once, to call attention to the statement, and at the same time to illustrate the anomalous state of our allegiance, where one private company can propose to sell and another to buy a British dominion as large as all England, France, and Germany. A single glance at the physical geography of the whole of British America will show that it forms, quite as much in structure as in size, one of the most valuable sections of the globe. Along this eastern coast the Almighty pours the broad Gulf Stream, nursed within the tropics, to temper the rigours of our air, to irrigate our "deep-sea pastures," to combat and to subdue the powerful Polar stream, which would otherwise in a single night fill all our gulfs and harbours with a barrier of perpetual ice. Far towards the west, beyond the wonderful lakes which excite the admiration of every traveller, the winds that lift the water-bearing clouds from the Gulf of Cortez, and waft them northward, are met by counter-currents, which capsize them just where they are essential—beyond Lake Superior, on both slopes of the Rocky Mountains. These are the limits of that climate which has been so much misrepresented—a climate which rejects every pestilence, which breeds no malaria; a climate under which the oldest stationary population—the French Canadians—have multiplied without the infusion of new blood, from France or elsewhere, from a stock of 80,000 in 1760, to a people of 880,000 in 1860. I need not, however, have gone so far for an illustration of the fostering effects of our climate on the European race, when I look on the sons and daughters of this Peninsula—natives

of the soil for two, three, and four generations ; when I see the lithe and manly forms on all sides around and before me ; when I see, especially, who they are that adorn that gallery (alluding to the ladies), the argument is over, the case is closed. If we descend from the climate to the soil, we find it sown by nature with those precious forests, fitted to erect cities, to build fleets, and to warm the hearths of many generations. We have the isotherm of wheat on the Red River, on the Ottawa, and on the St. John ; root crops everywhere ; coal in Cape Breton and on the Saskatchewan ; iron (with us) from the St. Maurice to the Trent ; in Canada, the copper-bearing rocks, at frequent intervals, from Huron to Gaspé ; gold in Columbia and in Nova Scotia ; salt, again, and hides, in the Red River region ; fisheries, inland and seaward, unequalled. Such is a rough sketch—a rapid enumeration of the resources of this land of our children's inheritance. Now, what needs it, this country, with a lake and river and seaward system sufficient to accommodate all its own and all its neighbours' commerce ? what needs such a country for its future ? It needs a population sufficient in numbers, in spirit, and in capacity, to become its masters ; and this population need, as all civilised men need, religious and civil liberty, unity, authority, free intercourse, commerce, security, and law.

As to population : the young ladies probably would not object that desirable young men should be somewhat more plentiful than they now are in these provinces. What would be a fair American ratio of population for our territory, covering, as it does, a third part of the continent ? Twenty millions of a total would give us only five inhabitants to the square mile—our square miles are four millions—a degree of denseness which even a backwoodsman would not find inconveniently close. Of the liberties enjoyed throughout all our part of the continent, it is to be observed, that with the temporary exceptions—Hudson's Bay and British Columbia—they are in the hands of the people's elected representatives. We need have no fear for our liberties if our representatives do their duty ; but as to the other social and political needs of which I have made

mention, that one about which I feel just at present most anxious, is authority. I am told I have been taunted a good deal in some leading American journals for my frequently expressed anxiety on this head. I have been taunted as a Liberal, as if lawful authority were inconsistent with liberality; and, as an Irishman by origin, I have not been spared. I answer, Mr. Mayor, to all these flippant deliverances, that if I lived in a state of society in which liberty was in danger from the encroachments or excesses of authority, I should stand fast by liberty; but, whereas, in our new world one plant is indigenous, and grows wild all round us, and the other must be introduced from afar and carefully cultivated, that other equally essential to the very existence of good government, I choose to concern myself most for that which we most need, leaving that which every public man is sure to cultivate, to the charge of its innumerable other guardians. I answer, as an Irishman proud of the name, that in walking in this path I am in the right line of succession with the most illustrious Irish statesmen of the past—O'Connell, Plunkett, Curran, Grattan, and, above all, Burke: their trophies are found on every arch of the temple of the Constitution—their effigies are carved upon the very shrines of its sanctuary. They were statesmen whom the world knew; they were as jealous of authority as they were vigilant for freedom: what names has the school that opposes them produced to equal the least among that illustrious succession? I do feel anxious for the consolidation of our provincial liberties—for the timely planting of a well-defined supreme authority among us, and, therefore, I adopt cordially the only practical form of arrangement which I can by any sign discover—the Union of all the Colonies, under the regency or vice-regency of a royal Prince, or other Imperial ruler. It will, perhaps, be within the recollection of those who hear me,—I rejoice to see around me some of the same friends to-night,—that several years ago, in this very room, I advocated, on commercial and political grounds, this same good cause of Colonial union. Is it not obvious, ladies and gentlemen,—you, to whom I am all but a stranger,—that if I

did not believe there were very good arguments in favour of such an union, I would not presume, after a lapse of years, to take up, on the same spot, the same cause, before the same community? These arguments, to my mind, are so numerous that I shall be obliged, as formerly, to proceed by way of selection—touching only on a few of the most prominent and popular.

First. There is the argument from Association. What is taught us by the whole history of our times? That the greatest results are produced by the association of small means. In banking, in commerce, in science, association has been tried; and found in general to work wonders. The very Intercolonial Railroad, of which I am by-and-by to speak, is a proof of the absolute necessity of intercolonial association. Canada cannot build it alone; you cannot do it without Canada. What then is the obvious remedy? Is it not the union of our joint credit, skill, and resources for the accomplishment of a common purpose, which singly none of us, nor all of us, can hope to effect?

Second. There is the commercial argument. Why should we, colonies of the same stock, provinces of the same empire, dominions under the same flag, be cutting each other's throats with razors called tariffs? Here, for example, is my overcoat of Canada tweed, which, imported into New Brunswick, is charged 15 per cent., and in Nova Scotia 10 per cent.—New Brunswick being 5 per cent. worse than you are. Now, the British Islands and all united states and kingdoms have long found it absolutely necessary to have within themselves the freest possible exchange of commodities. Why should not we here? Why should we not have untaxed admission to your 800,000 market, and you to our three million market? I confess I can see no good reason to the contrary. At the Quebec Conference,* over which I had the honour to preside, we decided that intercolonial free-trade should follow at once on the making of the railway, and I look back with satisfaction to having drafted that compact.

* The Intercolonial railway conference of September, 1862.

Third. There is the immigration argument. I was much struck, speaking on this point, with a note to an article in, I think, "Macculloch's Commercial Dictionary," in which immigrants bound for these Lower Provinces were warned not to take shipping to Canada, because it was as hard to get here from Quebec to these lower ports, as from Liverpool! Practically, every one knows that an emigrant ship's cargo is a mixed cargo. Say there are 400 persons aboard one of those ships arriving at New York, 100 will disperse towards the manufacturing districts of New England, another 100 to the mineral districts of Pennsylvania, while the other half will be divided between the landing-place and the agricultural West. The wide market makes the full ship. The diversities of occupation swell up the aggregate of new labourers, and if we were united the inevitable result would be that each of us would secure a much larger share as parts of one great State, than either or all of us can command as separated and obscure provinces. In the past what has been the fact? We gained but one million of British emigrants in all our provinces, from 1815 to 1860, while the United States gained three millions. Three of our natural born fellow-subjects passed us by for one that remained. They helped to swell the ranks and increase the riches of the Republic in a threefold ratio to ours, and they raised it in half a century to so high a pitch of prosperity, that prosperity-mad, it spurned the immigrant, and madly menaced those ancient islands from which it drew its first being as well as the whole outline of its civilisation.

Fourth. There is what I shall call the patriotic argument—the argument to be drawn from the absolute necessity of cultivating a high-hearted patriotism amongst us provincialists. I speak without offence—with an eye to my own part of the country as well as any other—when I ask, why are our ordinary politics so personal; why are our great men sometimes found so small? Because we are sectional and provincial in spirit as well as in fact; we are not simply shut up in our several corners, but we subdivide those corners into pettiest domains. With us, in

Canada, there is a Toronto party, an Ottawa party, or a Quebec party. It was said of old, "Octavius had his party, Antony had his party, but the Commonwealth has none,"—and thence the decline and fall of Rome: Are we capable in these lands of being inspired with sentiments of a saving patriotism? Are we capable of being kindled into a common passion for a common cause? Capable, I mean, of being made so in advance of events which might prevent the sacred fire from warming or guiding us on in a common contest. I don't ask you how you would feel down here, on the Gulf or the Bay of Fundy, if you heard Quebec was besieged—that Quebec had fallen. I have no doubt whatever that you would feel a common calamity then, or that we would equally feel it on the St. Lawrence, if we heard that Halifax had been attacked by a fleet of Monitors, or that a hostile force had crossed the St. John. But it might be too late then to remedy the evils of isolation—it would certainly be too late to avert some of the worst of them. Is it not the part of true wisdom now, while we yet have time—now while the actual emergency is not yet upon us—is not this the opportunity, since we must stand or fall together, if war comes, to consult how best we may conduct ourselves by each other, and towards England, so that we may stand, and not fall? so that England may trust, and not distrust us?

Fifth (and for the present lastly). There is the argument of political necessity, arising from the state of our next neighbours. I am not about to say one word—I can lay my hand on my heart and declare that I do not believe I have uttered one word since the commencement of the unhappy civil war—to irritate or embitter republican feeling against us. I deprecate all intermeddling on our part in that war, in which we were commanded to observe a strict neutrality, in spirit and in letter, and I would implore every man who values the blessing of good neighbourhood not wantonly to aggravate the existing bad feeling. In this case, certainly, they who "sow in bitterness" can hardly expect "to reap in joy." I say this in no idle hope or wish to conciliate northern prejudice in its present temper;

I say it as a lover of peace and a hater of causeless warfare; but if war must come upon us here, in these long peaceful regions, I have no doubt, for my part, that all our people, of every race and creed and class, will be found serried like iron in defence of our own freedom and the imperial connection which ensures it to us. I dare not pretend to predict the end of the present contest; but however otherwise it may end, there must long continue a powerful military element, active and unexhausted. If the South be subdued, armies will be needed to hold it down; if the combatants separate, each will arm his frontiers and replenish his arsenals. It seems to me a question mainly, in this light, whether we shall have two military independencies or one between us and Mexico? If two, then it would be but natural that they should turn back to back—as to their aggressive movements—the South marching south, the North marching north. You remember Pope's lines—

"Where is the North? In York 'tis on the Tweed!
In Scotland 'tis the Orcaes; and there—
'Tis Greenland, Zembla, or the Lord knows where!"

Where would be the limit of the North then? I put the question through you and through the press of Halifax to all British America. Where would be the limit of the North, in that contingency? I leave the answer to each for himself, while I, for my part, answer, that if these Provinces are united in good time, for mutual support, counsel, and protection, I do not fear that they would be able to hold their own against all comers.

So much for the obvious arguments in favour of Colonial union; the argument from Association: the argument from Commercial advantages: the Immigration argument; the Patriotic argument proper; and the argument drawn from the proximity of danger, from the circumstances existing in the neighbouring States. Here, I quit the general subject, and now beg to come directly to the topic most immediate—the necessity—the absolute necessity on all these grounds—of an intercolonial railroad.

I am not here to discuss, nor would you care to hear, a detailed discussion of the long-continued negotiations on this subject. *But I must take this opportunity of declaring, as one cognisant of all the facts (I think I may say so,) of the last negotiation, that the imputation of bad faith so freely made here and in England, against the Canadian delegates who went over last year, is a groundless and undeserved accusation. I do not desire to be at all disputatious; I think I may say I am impartial in the matter—for with some of the gentlemen as responsible as I was for that negotiation, on the part of Canada, I no longer act: but whether with them or against them, I utterly deny for them and for Canada, the imputation of bad faith. I will tell you candidly how the question is viewed in Canada. Leading public men of all political parties admit that it is most desirable, if the liability could be limited, that this great work, so long projected, should be undertaken. There is no parliamentary party, there is no Cabinet possible, that would say, or dare say,—“no railroad—no connexion—on any terms.” At the same time, the non-political men of influence—many in Eastern, and many more in Western Canada, many also of the constituencies, are not favourable to the project at all—certainly not to it as a Government work; they were so scorched by the Grand Trunk, they say, that they dread the fire of any other railroad. In some respects the popular prejudices against the whole thing are not unfounded; but in others, I am bound to say their only basis is a melancholy want of information, as to the extent, resources, and capabilities of this part of British America. The prejudice really, in these last aspects, is against New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, as countries, rather than against the road. People say, “What do we want with a railway down there? No one lives down there. We have no trade, we are never likely to have any trade with them. The land is a wilderness, and the winter would render the road impassable.” This is, of course, gross assumption; but has not every great improvement to encounter just such assumptions? Was not the Reciprocity Treaty carried against prejudices as perverse—as

Ch. 18.

contrary to the facts? Was not the Union of the Canadas themselves a conquest over far worse prejudices? And it is because this want of knowledge can only be combated by intelligence, that I am a volunteer in the needful work of making the different provinces acquainted with each other. It is not harder to pull a prejudice than to pull a tooth—and the unsounder it is, the more necessary to have it out. I invoke intelligence on our side. To combat against such lamentable misconception everything helps, from a weather almanac up to a Scriptural quotation, and even if the railroad should not soon go on, the labours of intelligence will not be altogether lost. In one sentence, ladies and gentlemen, I do not hesitate for my part to say, that if it can be shown to the satisfaction of the people of Canada that the country through which the road would pass, is naturally rich for three-fourths of the way in soil and in minerals; if it can be shown (as is the fact) that, thanks to your warm-hearted neighbour, the Gulf Stream, your winters are far milder than ours, either in Lower or Central Canada; if it can be shown that the liability could be limited to three, or even three and a half millions sterling; if it can be shown that private capitalists able and willing for the work might be found to undertake it; then, ladies and gentlemen, on all these showings, which I myself believe to be perfectly possible, I have no hesitation in saying that the people of Canada, for their own sakes, and for the sake of British connection, would sustain their government in entering at once on this great work, and thus rendering practicable the so desirable Union of all the Colonies.

Here, perhaps, I best may pause. A very few words, and I am done. This great project of Union was, as you know, endorsed by Lord Durham, the Imperial High Commissioner to these Provinces, in 1838. Of late years it had been sustained through all vicissitudes, on this side of the Atlantic, mainly by the advocacy of the many able public men Nova Scotia has given to political life. Some—the chief among them (turning to Messrs. Johnson, Howe, Tupper, Henry, &c.), I have the satisfaction of seeing here,

beside me. They are here, irrespective of party, and I trust I may add, that I have endeavoured, not only out of care for the subject, but from respect to them, to treat the subject wholly without allusion to party, or local distinctions. In the presence of the great subject as I contemplate it, the lines of party are effaced and disappear. I endeavour to contemplate it in the light of a future, possible, probable, and I hope to live to be able to say positive, British-American Nationality. For I repeat in the terms of the question I asked at first, what do we need to construct such a Nationality? Territory, resources by sea and land, civil and religious freedom—these we already have. Four millions we already are—four millions culled from the races that for a thousand years have led the van of Christendom. When the sceptre of Christian civilisation trembled in the enervate grasp of the Greeks of the Lower Empire, then the western tribes of Europe, fiery, hirsute, clamorous, but kindly, snatched at the falling prize, and placed themselves at the head of human affairs. We are the children of these fire-tried kingdom-founders, of these ocean-discoverers of western Europe. Analyse our aggregate population: we have more Saxons than Alfred had when he founded the English realm; we have more Celts than Brien had when he put his heel on the neck of Odin; we have more Normans than William had when he marshalled his invading host along the strand of Falaise. We have the laws of St. Edward and St. Louis; Magna-Charta and the Roman Code; we speak the speeches of Shakespeare and Bossuet; we copy the constitution which Burke and Somers and Sidney and Sir Thomas More lived or died to secure or save. Out of these august elements, in the name of the future generations who shall inhabit all the vast regions we now call ours, I invoke the fortunate genius of an united British America, to solemnise law with the moral sanctions of religion, and to crown the fair pillar of our freedom with its only appropriate capital, lawful authority, so that, hand in hand, we and our descendants may advance steadily to the accomplishment of a common destiny.

INTERCOLONIAL RELATIONS AND THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

AN ADDRESS AT MECHANICS' INSTITUTE, ST. JOHN, N.B., AUGUST, 1863.

MR. MCGEE said :—Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—The postponement of the present address from Friday evening last till to-night, which I hope has not caused the Committee or the citizens of St. John any inconvenience, arose from my strong desire to see a part of Nova Scotia, of which the traveller, hurried by rail from Windsor to Halifax, has no conception,—I allude to the beautiful valley between Windsor and Annapolis. For two entire days we traversed that beautiful valley—looking out on those fertile marshes, celebrated in the hexameters of Longfellow, breathing the perfume of meadows, of corn-fields, and of orchards. In no part of North America have I seen a lovelier, or apparently a more prosperous, country. I do not wonder that our countrymen of Nova Scotia should be proud of what they called the Garden of their Province, or that they should—for they are a most hospitable people—desire to give strangers such a treat, as a journey through that 80 or 90 miles of their “happy valley.”

While referring to Nova Scotia, I may be permitted, perhaps, to say, that I think the good cause of Colonial Union received a powerful *impetus* the other night at Halifax. When I left here a fortnight ago, I had no intention whatever of speaking on that subject during my visit to Nova Scotia; but I sincerely rejoice now that the delivery of the address, or lecture, which my friends requested for a local charity, was the occasion of an expression of public opinion by the first men and first

journalists of that Province, which must be considered most timely and most important. We had, accidentally, present on that evening, my hon. friend the leader of the Government of this Province (Mr. Tilley), with the leading Nova Scotians, and I am sure the practical evidence afforded of the possibility of the union and concord of the public men of these Provinces, was an illustration the most striking that could be furnished to the arguments which had been advanced. Perhaps you will further indulge me in taking this first opportunity to return my warm personal thanks to the people and press of Nova Scotia, for their very great and very undeserved kindness to myself, during my stay among them.

You are aware, ladies and gentlemen, that the immediate object of the present lecture was to advance the organization of our friend Captain Millet's Volunteer Company. I am sure I shall only be too happy if I can contribute anything in this, or in any other way, to foster a resident military spirit in these Colonies. Every one must see that such a spirit, generously encouraged and wisely directed, is essential to our continuance as free communities; that every drill-room and every armory is a high school of patriotism; and that the popularity of our Volunteers is the fittest expression we can give to the general feeling of public spirited attachment to our free Institutions. In endeavouring to meet, in this respect, the wishes of the Volunteers, we selected, as the subject for consideration,—Intercolonial Relations, and the Intercolonial Railway—a subject naturally and inseparably associated with the causes which have called the Volunteers into existence; and most plainly of all, with the leading questions of Colonial defences and British connection.

I did not touch, at Halifax, on this subject of Colonial defences, because I had matter enough and to spare, of a political and commercial kind: and because I wished to reserve its discussion for the present more appropriate occasion, when, speaking for the Volunteers of St. John, I could more properly introduce the subject of defence, as understood in the Province in which I reside. All parties

there—theoretically at least—admit that the Imperial connection, as now existing, is well worth fighting for; all parties admit that the extent of our ability is the measure of our responsibility; but no one with us, endorses the doctrine of the new school of Colonial reformers in England, that our measure of local “self-government” necessarily includes self-defence. We hold to the old doctrine, that peace and war are the dread prerogatives that attach to sovereignty only; that to provide means and measures of defence attach as responsibilities to these prerogatives; that not being sovereign powers we can neither make war nor cause war to cease; and, therefore, that our contribution towards the defences of these Provinces must needs be secondary, as our powers and responsibilities are secondary, to those of the Empire at large. But while we hold these maxims, all of us, absolutely, we cheerfully acknowledge that the sacrifices made by the Imperial Government in maintaining the West India fleet—as much for our protection as that of the West Indies—in maintaining the great fortresses from Halifax to Kingston—in dispatching her Guards, as she did in December, 1861, to guard our frontier—we cheerfully and gratefully admit, that these sacrifices on the part of the Sovereign State, demand sacrifices in turn from us, and that, cost what it may, we must, in Canada, for some time to come, maintain a large and effective Militia. The late Government, of which I was a member, armed and equipped in a few months 25,000 men, and enrolled about 10,000 other volunteers, for whose equipment Parliament had made no provision. It is not, perhaps, too much to say, that Canada can and will raise, as a precautionary force, 50,000 active service men; and in case of necessity, I have no doubt we could double the number in a reasonable time.

Perhaps you will allow me to remark here, on the recent views promulgated in England, by Mr. Goldwin Smith, Mr. Adderley, M.P., and others, as to the military relations sustained by the thirteen colonies who became the United States, relations contrasted by those gentlemen with the similar relations sustained by us, much to our disparage-

ment. These views have been very ably criticised in a pamphlet by my friend the Honorable Mr. Howe, published at London during the present year; but Mr. Howe dealt with the immediate rather than the historical aspects of the question as stated by Mr. Adderléy and Mr. Smith. Those gentlemen contrast invidiously as against us, what they call the "self-reliance" of the revolted colonies, in this matter of defence. Now what are the real facts in relation to this military connection of those ex-Colonies with Great Britain during the last century? I utterly deny that there is extant a document, despatch, or precedent, to show that those English settlements ever considered themselves principals in their own defence against France, Spain, or Holland. Against the Narragansetts or the Iroquois they acted for themselves, but when the quarrel was Imperial—when the enemy was a great civilised power, —whatever contingent force they contributed to the campaign,—they claimed their bounty and got it out of the Crown Lands; they claimed their pay and got it out of the Imperial Treasury. The very terms they employed, "Queen Anne's war," "King George's war," showed the state of their public opinion; in "the French and Indian war"—known in Europe as the "Seven years' war"—the genius of Chatham contrived to make them more prominent in their own quarrel; but even on that eve of supreme triumph for the English in North America, they never held any other language than that which we hold in Canada, when we contend that the power to make peace or war alone comprehends the duty of providing adequate ways and means of defence. The memorial of the royal governors of New York and New England, Shirley and Clinton, to the Lords of Trade, in 1748; the correspondence of Governors Hutchinson and Dobbs; the plan of Union submitted at the Albany Conference of 1754, by Dr. Franklin; every document of that period, does, in my opinion, place the question just where it now is, that the main defence rests on the Imperial, and the secondary only on the Colonial authorities. Governors Shirley and Clinton were so convinced from "past experience" that New York

and New England "*would never agree on quotas*" (towards Colonial defence), that they saw no hope of getting anything done except by the direct intervention of the Crown, "by royal instructions." I refer to this entire despatch, and to many other papers on the same subject, published in the voluminous *Colonial Records of New York*, to show that we have not degenerated from the example of the elder Colonies in their best days; to show that the charge is at least not made out as completely as Mr. Adderley would have his English readers believe.

I advocate the union of the Provinces on, among other grounds, that of better providing for the common defence. I am committing no indiscretion—because their report has been published by order of the Imperial Parliament and of the Canadian Assembly—when I allude to the fact that the late Royal Defence Commission, in Canada, laid great stress on the completion of what they call "the Quebec and Halifax Railway" as a military work. But we have even a better evidence of its importance—the evidence of fact. You all remember when, at the time of the Trent affair, the *Persia* and other transports were dispatched with troops for Canada in the month of December. They were to get a certain sum if they landed them here or at Halifax, and nearly double the sum if they landed them in the St. Lawrence. Well, the *Persia* made her way up to Rivière du Loup, but she was obliged to run from that port, leaving some of her boats and men behind her, before half the soldiers were landed; the remainder I believe she brought round here. This occurrence, which happened early in the winter, indicated precisely the military position of Canada for four or five months in the year, and with Canada, New Brunswick, at least, must stand or fall. Nova Scotia, guarded by fleets and fortresses, might be made a sort of cis-Atlantic Gibraltar or Malta, but your destiny and ours, gentlemen, is as inseparable as are the waters which pour into the Bay Chaleurs, rising, though they do, on the one hand on the Canadian, and on the other on the New Brunswick Highlands. Geographically, we are bound up beyond the power of extrication; your Northern coun-

ties, a great and flourishing portion of this Province, front on our waters; the Miramichi and the Restigouche draining their thousands of square miles of territory, must forever associate New Brunswick and Canada as co-partners in the advantages and the casualties of the commerce of the Gulf. When, therefore, I advocate our future union I only follow Nature; the text is given us by Nature; it is for man to make the commentary.

All states and forms of ancient and modern civilisation have been the result of human intelligence, supplementing and supplying the requirements of nature. Voices cried aloud from the void, and man hastened to respond. Thus, in the Plain of Egypt what was needed of old was elevation, and man multiplied the column, the obelisk, and the Pyramid; thus what was needed in modern Europe was expansion, and man invented the mariner's compass, the ocean ship, and the art of navigation. So uncouth rivers have become celebrated in song, and obscure scenes, glorified by the footsteps of romance, attract wanderers in search of health or pleasure, from the ends of the earth. With the same cry, do the gigantic, dislocated fragments of British America, appeal to our hearts, our senses, and our reason; there they lie outstretched, longing for unity—if we are a generation worthy to organize a nation, assuredly the materials are abundant and are at hand!

I shall not go over again the arguments I adduced at Halifax, drawn from our mutually destructive tariffs, and from the immense results achieved by the principle of association, in our times; but I may perhaps, without impropriety, refer again to the argument to be drawn from the laws which govern immigration and settlement to these Provinces, as compared with the neighbouring states. Many persons express surprise to me, that notwithstanding the civil war, the immigration into the United States should be so immense, and into Canada so comparatively little. It seems to me, that the very existence of the war itself, as long as it is unaccompanied by insolvency, may account for this. Suppose 50,000 mechanics and 200,000 agriculturists have been cut off in this war while the con-

sumption of the country is not seriously impeded, it is clear there must be an enhanced demand, just now, for a quarter of a million of men to supply their places. It is thus the wide field makes the full ship, and the port from which the redistribution of diverse industries takes place over the greatest extent of country, draws to itself the strong and perpetual stream of fructifying foreign labour. You have in the interior of New Brunswick—I speak on the authority of the Agricultural Professor Johnston—one of the finest unsettled tracts in North America, a tract through which I hope yet to travel by railroad—within sight of the houses of tens of thousands of the proprietors of the soil. But while the maritime Provinces are disunited from Canada, and Canada from them, we are comparatively unseen and unfelt in Europe—we present on the map our puny outlines in vain; give to the Provinces the aspect of Empire, and you will see how strangers will turn to them with such reverence as the Parsee does to the rising Sun.

I am well aware, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot have Union, that we cannot even have a commercial league, without other means of intercourse than we now possess. There was some fanciful talk formerly among us in Canada, that the people of Maine might wish by-and-by to cast in their lot with us, and thus make Maine the bond of connection, east and west. This commanding position seems, however, clearly reserved for New Brunswick, which alone can unite Nova Scotia and Canada. Now what, you will ask, in your opinion, is the greatest obstacle to the establishment of such direct intercourse? I answer unhesitatingly, ignorance of each other's true resources and condition. It is not the distance; it is not the cost; it is not the disputes about routes or modes of construction; it is Intercolonial ignorance which, primarily, stands in the way of the Intercolonial Railway. For example, very intelligent people with us, especially in Western Canada, will insist that the winter down here is so severe that the road, if made, would be blocked up all the winter with ice and snow. In vain we show that your 100 miles of railroad, and Nova Scotia's 60, have not been stopped by such

causes five days in five years; it is hard to displace preconceived ideas. They argue in this absurd way;—Lower Canada is colder than Upper Canada, therefore, the Lower Provinces are colder than Lower Canada. Now, what are the exact facts on this much misunderstood subject of climate? (I select the figures from the tables prepared for the *Smithsonian Institute* in 1860, which included all North America.) The mean annual temperature of this and the Nova Scotia coast, taken at the highest and lowest points—Windſor and Pictou—ranges from 51.43 at the former, to 42.09 at the latter—the lowest point being 2 degrees higher than Quebec, and the highest being 2 degrees higher than Hamilton, Canada West; and the average being nearly 3 degrees higher than the mean annual temperature of Montreal or Toronto. It is all in vain to show them this, and to point to Professor Johnston's report. In spite of agriculturists, geologists, and statistics, like dear old Christopher North in *Blackwood's Magazine*, who, having once called Montgomery a Moravian, declared, notwithstanding the poet's own denial, that Blackwood having called him a Moravian, a Moravian he must be to the end of the chapter,—those Canadians having made up their minds that New Brunswick is a wilderness, declared that a wilderness it must be. It is useless to tell them of the Gulf Stream. They will not believe in the Gulf Stream. I sincerely hope that we will soon be able to knock this prop from under the tottering form of ancient prejudice, and that we will hear no more of the insuperable obstacle of your winter climate. Others are frightened because the Grand Trunk was such a drain on our Province, and argue that the Intercolonial would be just such another.

I admit, however, that there are specious and even reasonable objections to the undertaking being directed or controlled by the political parties in power, for the time being, in these Provinces. I admit that there are some good grounds for alleging that Lord Palmerſton's Government seem disposed to drive a rather hard bargain with the Colonies. I admit that the expenditure ought to be estimated,

with proximate certainty, before the Legislature of the several Provinces should be called upon to give effect to the project.

On all these grounds there is fair room for discussion and argument; but how any man who looks beyond the hour, can deny the vital necessity for a road, on some conditions, is really what I cannot conceive. No party—no Government in Canada—could take that extreme ground, and live; no man pretending to the character of a statesman would venture on such ground. A resolution opposing the project absolutely was once proposed in the Canadian Parliament, and only seven persons, besides the mover, voted for it in a house of over a hundred. And such, I am certain, would be the fate of any similar vote moved now after a general election. In fact, a feeling of uneasiness pervades the thinking portion of the Canadian people. They feel that a more intimate connection with England is necessary, and that if this is to be effected we must ourselves draw nearer to the mother country. I deny that there was any want of faith on the part of the Canadian Government in the late negotiations in London on this subject. We may have thought the Imperial Government were driving a hard bargain with us, and that they ought to regard this road as a work of military defence; but no one who knows the gentlemen who went as Delegates from Canada could believe them capable of acting in bad faith. With one of those gentlemen I am not acting politically, but whether acting with him or against him, I feel it my duty to bear witness to his integrity and his high sense of honour. Notwithstanding all the difficulties that lie in the way, however, I do not despair of seeing this great work go on, with your and Nova Scotia's co-operation.

Although I have usually put forward defensive and commercial reasons for the road, I confess to you frankly, that I place as high, or even higher than either, reasons more purely political. I am, from conviction and observation, in favour of giving the constitutional monarchy a fair trial in British America. In the language of the Hon. Premier of Nova Scotia the other night, I am desirous to see that form of free government working side by side with the

Republican form of free government on this continent. For, I maintain that the limited monarchy, with representative institutions, is as essentially a free government as any republic that ever existed. The name republic is not always synonymous with freedom, as we may see in Venice and ancient Rome; indeed some kingdoms have been administered throughout upon republican principles, and some republics upon despotic principles. I acknowledge the salutary efficacy of what Burke called "the suppressed republicanism" of the British system, and that there are periods and circumstances in which it ought not to be suppressed; hence seeking anxiously for my adopted country stability as well as the largest liberty, I confess I turn, after many anxious years of consideration, to the expedient of an inviolable head, with responsible advisers, as the only one yet known among men which can give us, in harmonious proportions, a government preservative of freedom, and conservative of law.

[Here the reporter resorts to the "third person."]

The lecturer dwelt at great length on this subject. He had arrived at his present convictions slowly and somewhat painfully, often forced by experience and reflection to abandon theories which he had believed to be sound, and principles which he had supposed to be just. Liberty and authority were parts of the same thing, and without authority true liberty could not exist. If a monarchy were not possible, and to join the American Democracy were not desirable, what course should they mark out for themselves? Canada could not go on long in the course she is following. She has made the Upper Chamber elective—and as a body representing the people it can claim the right to control money grants. The West having outgrown Lower Canada, demands representation according to population. He believed the principle to be just, and that the demand must one day be complied with. In all these Provinces the authority of the head of the Government has been diminished until it is now almost nugatory. In England this is not so, for the Crown being the fountain of honour, the influence of the monarch is, and always must be, great. The experience of

all ages has shown that in times of peril authority is essential to the welfare or even to the existence of the State, and that if the head of the Government had his authority unduly impaired in times of peace, he must when danger threatens, burst all these shackles, and, it may be, in the spirit of the highest patriotism assume a degree of power necessary for the protection of the rights and liberties of the people as well as of his own inheritance. The powers now assumed by the President of the neighbouring republic in suspending the Habeas Corpus, and ordering the arrest of persons and the suppression of newspapers, often by telegraph, showed that this was true. In this, history is but repeating itself. The Roman Republic two thousand years ago, when danger threatened, sensible that its electoral system was not adapted to emergencies, substituted the Consul by a Dictator.

It had been his fortune, he said, to live twice under a Republic, and twice under a Monarchy, and therefore, besides what he read on the subject, he had an introspective view of the working of the two systems. From his own observation, he was satisfied that the United States was not the place where a person with European notions and ideas could desire to bring up his family. Their respect for religion, for authority, for law, for old age—all that constitutes the strongest and most enduring bonds of society—all that thinking men value most, is fast disappearing. Where the most awful and most holy names are used so constantly and so profanely, in the most odious asseverations and the most fearful blasphemy, it was but natural to expect that some great calamity must come for the purgation of people prosperity-mad. But the calamity he anticipated was social, not political. He never did anticipate that the institutions of the country would prove a total failure. In one way or other the monarchies of Europe had carried on the great work of government for a thousand years. The unity of the States, framed by great and wise men, has not outlived three generations. He would not say that the Americans had not made some important discoveries in politics, as well as in machinery, and excellent adaptations

of old principles to modern circumstances; but the system, for want of authority, nevertheless must be recast. He asked the audience to reflect how essential to good government the existence of authority is. The Atlantic has washed out of the people of these Provinces many old world prejudices, as well those that are good and salutary as those that are the reverse; yet without the principle of authority, what is there to give stability to the government or to secure the liberties of the people? What avails it that the rich dews and rains of heaven fall on the sandy desert, if there be no cisterns to catch and preserve the water for the sustentation of animal and human life? Whatever be the result of the present struggle on the Potomac and the Mississippi, this much was evident, that we are no longer to have a pacific Republic as our neighbours. Beyond our border will henceforth be a great military power, and we must hasten to decide whether we are to be regarded as crude republics, which, after a few more ripening summers have passed over us, shall fall into the open maw of the great republic, or as destined to form a great northern constitutional monarchy. The condition of these Provinces cannot continue very long to be what it now is. The connection with the Empire is little more than the allegiance which we pay to the Sovereign so earnestly and warmly in words, and yet entails on us responsibilities which may prove too weighty if we are not united under a constitutional monarchy, framed after the pattern of that Government with which we have been so long connected. We cannot have much that has gone to form the present English nation. We cannot have a Norman conquest or Feudal laws; but we may have authority, stability; a revenue for all the things necessary to safety, and the most ample measure of freedom. It has been said of old that empire comes from the North. Shall not we, free from the despotism of Asia, the slavery of America, the pauperism of Europe, create out of these disconnected Provinces which are now unknown to Europe, unknown to America, unknown one to the other, which instead of looking to one another, and aiding one another, stand back to back and

look to London, to Paris, or to Washington, a great constitutional monarchy, with strength and authority in the government, justice and truth in its councils, and liberty everywhere—a country to be admired and respected by all nations? Henceforth a balance of power—a principle introduced in Europe as a substitute for the temporal supremacy of the Popes—would be necessary to prevent the aggrandizement of the strong and the oppression of the weak. Even Mexico, with its people whose blood was one-eighth Spanish and seven-eighths that of the savage native tribes, was endeavouring to prepare for this future; and would not these Provinces become, as they easily might, a power able to maintain its own independence? The time, he said, was suited for such a change. In the time of the Regency, when the greatest talents were properly employed in exposing to ridicule and contempt the degrading vices of the Sovereign, it would have been difficult; but the virtues, public and private, of the Queen have shed a new lustre on the authority she wields, as the virtues, public and private, and even the domestic afflictions, of Maria Theresa won back the affection and loyalty of the Hungarians for the House of Hapsburg.

The lecturer [says the reporter] concluded as follows:—

This being my general view of my own duty—my sincere, slow-formed conviction of what a British-American policy should be—I look forward to the time when these Provinces, once united, and increasing at an accelerated ratio, may become a Principality, worthy of the acceptance of one of the sons of that Sovereign whose reign inaugurated the firm foundation of our Colonial liberties. If I am right, the railroad will give us Union, Union will give us nationality, and nationality a Prince of the blood of our ancient kings. These speculations on the future may be thought premature and fanciful—but what is premature in America? Propose a project which has life in it, and while still you speculate it grows. If that way towards greatness, which I have ventured to point out to our scattered communities, be practicable, I have no fear that it will not be taken even in my time. If it be not practicable—well then, at least,

I shall have this consolation, that I have invited the intelligence of these Provinces to rise above partisan contests and personal warfare, to the consideration of great principles, healthful and ennobling in their discussion, to the minds of men.

Let me, before I close, offer with great respect a single suggestion to the British American Press. I have been here, in the lower Provinces, nearly three weeks, and, except a very occasional paragraph, I have not seen a single quotation from the press of Canada; the same thing, I know, holds true with us. Now is it not possible to remedy this fatal absence of intercommunication through the Press? Is it not possible, both here and in Canada, that we should give a little more attention to each other's affairs, so that when the time comes when we must act together—as come it will—we may learn to meet like old friends, rather than as aliens and strangers?

Mr. Chairman—I beg to repeat once more here in St. John, what I have said this night week in Halifax, that there is no party in Canada opposed to the great enterprise which is to give us union, strength, and security. In that firm conviction I return to my home, prepared to take my humble part—and all the better prepared, I hope, from this visit along-shore—in furtherance of that great measure. I need not appeal to your public men and public writers to judge justly and generously of their contemporaries in the sister Provinces; I am sure that they will do so—for all know, who are publicists, how much we stand in need of fair play and a fair construction of our motives. I do not attempt to prejudge the present Canadian Administration, but I will be much surprised if, whether they stand or fall, many among them do not prove to be staunch friends of union and authority. At all events, there are before the public men of British America at this moment but two courses—either to drift with the tide of democracy, or to seize the golden moment and fix for ever the monarchical character of our institutions. We have now two choices—representative government or democracy; which shall we choose? For my part, I choose the former, and I invite every fellow

colonist who agrees with me to unite our efforts, that we may give our Provinces the aspect of Empire, in order to exercise influence abroad and at home, to create a state and to originate a History, "which the world will not willingly let die."

THE FUTURE OF CANADA

SUBSTANCE OF A LECTURE DELIVERED AT ST. LAWRENCE HALL, TORONTO,
NOVEMBER 26TH, 1863.

MR. MCGEE said :—I am, to speak to you to-night, ladies and gentlemen, of "The Future of Canada." It is a subject on which I have already spoken frequently in other towns and cities, and I trust it may not be without its interest—judging by the array before me it is not without its interest—for Toronto. Before, however, entering on the discussion of the subject, let me take you all, without preface, into my confidence. I may say, then, that I find it exceedingly difficult to discuss any subject, within a thousand miles of the topics of the day, without exciting the most extraordinary speculations. Our provincial public have many excellent qualities, but they are rather too narrow in the matter of motives of conduct. Is it not possible, for example, to use the words "Canada," "America," "Government," or "Constitution," without subjecting oneself to the suspicion of wrapping up a partisan speech in the disguise of a popular lecture? I remember well, when, some years ago, I delivered a purely didactic lecture in this very place, on "The Political Morality of Shakspeare's Plays," some of the critics of the day saw only in my dissertation a clever partisan manœuvre; but I trust the day has already come, when it will be admitted that it is possible, even for a politician, to choose a great subject of general interest, and to discuss it on its merits, without compromising himself by attempting to steal a march on any portion of his audience. It has been objected to my treatment of this subject, that it is theoretical; that it puts me in the position, for which I own myself wholly unsuited, of a teacher of loyalty; that I

mingle in the discussion injurious criticisms on our Republican neighbours. To these objections, I answer, that though theoretical to-day, our future will be practical to-morrow; that I do not, and never did, place myself in the position of a preacher of loyalty; that I preach rather security, I preach precaution, I preach self-preservation; that if I criticise the American system of government, I equally criticise our own, and I trust no one will deny me that right of free discussion, which within proper bounds is one of the first—if not the very first—of the rights which constitute the common stock of our freedom. In glancing over the political map of Europe and America, the patent fact strikes every one, that in the old world the governments, with hardly an exception, are monarchical, while in the new world they are republican; Switzerland on the old continent, and Brazil on the new, are alone exceptions to the rule.* From this prevalence of one invariable type on each side the Atlantic, one might be led to conclude that there was some natural fitness, in each case, of the constitution to the circumstances. I do not pretend to deny that it is natural for a larger liberty to flourish in these new regions; that the new-found forest gave way for freedom but not for privilege; but if we look closer, I think we will discern that there are as many varieties among the States calling themselves republican as there are among monarchies; that some monarchies, in all but name, might be considered republics, while some republics partake largely, if not of a monarchical, certainly of an oligarchical character. We must not allow ourselves to be misled by names alone in this discussion, but if possible we must endeavour to force our way through that cactus-fence into the presence of the things themselves. The circumstances of the new world, North and South, were certainly favourable to the erection of republics. The monarchy did not emigrate; the metropolis, with all its attractions, remained in the parent State; the aggrandisement of labour was the foundation of new communities; the old Colonial relation was strained till it

* Mexico has since been added to the American exceptions.

snapped, and then, by its own bold act, rather than the provision of the parent State, the Colony sprang into independence. Such is the invariable history of the Anglo-American and Spanish-American States, which have preceded us in the pathway of nationality. I allude to them because I know only two teachers capable of instructing us in the way in which we, too, should go,—cotemporary events, and the voice of History. If we go to the oracles of the past, in a sincere spirit of inquiry, we shall never fail of instruction. But we shall find there precisely what we seek for: if we consult History in a spirit of Hatred we shall find there poisonous and deadly weapons enough; but if, in a sincere desire to know and to hold fast by the truth, we seek that source of political wisdom, we can never come away empty or disappointed. And then—as to events; if a man be cotemporary to a great event and will not see it; if the event speaks with the voice of a cannonade, and men will not hear it, the fault and the loss are with that ago; a deaf and dumb stolidity which sometimes entails its consequences on after ages. In America, the cardinal events would seem to be, its discovery; the importation of the African as a slave; the revolt of the Thirteen Colonies in 1776; the final abandonment by Spain of South America in 1823; and the Civil War of 1861. If I am not mistaken we are cotemporaries of an event,—this war of Secession,—as instructive for us, as the success of Columbus or of Washington was, for the men of their generations. Looking back to History, and out of the world we live in, I feel as if we, in Canada, with our anxious three millions, and our peculiar situation, were about to embark like the voyagers of old, who first left behind them the pillars of Hercules to sail into the external sea. British precedent and American example are the landmarks of the god for us; beyond them we must go, but it is still in our power to say, on which shore we shall sacrifice, and under which auspices we shall elect to prosecute our destined course. For my own part, ladies and gentlemen, I have considered the problem of American example at its source, and it is one I do not feel free in commending to my countrymen of Canada.

For me, it has the fatal defect of instability and inconstancy. It may be that, out of their present tribulation, the national character will consolidate and establish itself; but up to the present, whether in manners or in ideas, there has not been that fixity of character in the republic which—even supposing everything there to be for the best—would justify any observer in proposing it as a model to other communities. The colony-bred men who founded the republic, were men with English ideas of law and government. George Washington was quite as ceremonious in his official conduct as George III. He drove to open the first Congress with “buff and blue” liveries—postilions and footmen; and in his bearing towards ambassadors and private citizens, he preserved all the gravity and dignity of a sovereign. As to the judicial office, from the highest to the lowest—from the decisions of the supreme court to the pettiest jurisdictions—the Americans of to-day have departed much farther from the ideas of their grandfathers than we in Canada have, from the English of the age of Alfred. In the legislative department of government, new opinions, no less opposed to the old colonial wisdom, have prevailed. Makers and managers of elections, under the name of conventions, act for the people on the one hand and the candidate on the other; and after the election, the convention leaders naturally constitute themselves “the lobby,” or third house (as it is called), at Washington and all the state capitals. Having made the legislators and the governors in conclave, it is natural they should look after them in office; it is natural, but it is deplorable, that this vast organised, extra-constitutional body called “the lobby,” should dictate its will to those whom it has called into existence. In manners, which are the types of stability or of inconstancy, not less than in ideas, the internal revolution has proceeded, is proceeding, and probably must proceed much further, from the standard of the age of Washington. If the Puritan fathers were to revisit Boston to-day, and hear bits of Mozart music, pouring out of Gothic churches blazoned with stained glass, they could hardly imagine that the congregations boasted themselves the children of the

Puritans. These signs of change may seem trivial in themselves, but if, as an ancient sage maintained, a change in a nation's music includes a change in its morals, I surely am not attaching too much importance to them, as illustrations of the absence of stability and fixedness in the American character. If, then, I am correct, in assigning to it this description, I say to those who, secretly or openly, are preaching up Americanism among us, show us that the model you propose to us to imitate is a definite model; show us that what you ask us to copy is stable and certain; otherwise you propose that we shall grasp at the rainbow on the spray of the cataract, even at the risk of tumbling into Niagara! As to the other original of a free State, the British Constitution, it, at least, will be allowed, even by its enemies, the merit of stability. As it exists to-day, it has existed for many hundreds of years. It may be said that it is rather strange for an Irishman, who spent his youth in resisting that government in his native country, to be found amongst the admirers of British constitutional government in Canada. To that remark, this is my reply:—if in my day Ireland had been governed as Canada is now governed, I would have been as sound a constitutionalist as is to be found in Ireland.

But although I was not born and bred in the school to see the merits of the British constitutional system, I trust I am not going to quarrel with the sun and the elements, because of late days it has rained 200 days out of the 365 in the year, on the particular spot of earth on which I was born. I take the British constitutional system as the great original upon which must be founded the institutions of all new free States. I take it as one of a family born of Christian civilisation, and of the marriage of that Germanic empire, or rather race, which, breaking into nationalities, transmitted it to other empires to mould for them free institutions. I take it, as combining in itself permanency and liberty—liberty in its best form, not in theory alone, but in practice—liberty at this hour, enjoyed and practised by all the people of Canada of every origin and creed. Can any one pretend to say that a chapter of accidents,

which we can trace for eight hundred, and which some antiquarians may even trace for a much longer period, will account for the permanence of any one set of institutions? If you say that they have not in themselves the elements of permanency—if they have not the saving salt which preserves the formation of the Government of a free state from one generation to another—how do you account for their continued and prosperous existence—how do you account for it that of all the ancient institutions of Europe this alone remains; and remains not only with all its ancient outlines, but with great modern improvements, and even alterations, but alterations some of which might more properly be called restorations, and all of which have been made in harmony with the design of the first architects? Here is a form of government that has lasted with modifications to suit the spirit of the age for a period of 800 years; and here is another that has lasted 80 years, if it may not now be said to be re-revolutionised by the exigencies of the civil war. One has had a career of eight centuries, and the other of two-and-a-half generations. How is it that I account for the permanency of the institutions of the first? Because, in the first place, their outline plan, whatever abuse or injustice may have been the occasional result of the system, combined all that has ever been discovered in the science of government of material importance. The wisdom of the middle age and the modern, of the earliest political writers and those of a late day, have all laid down one maxim of government—that no unmixed form of government can satisfy the wants of a free and intelligent people; that unmixed democracy, for instance, must result in anarchy or military despotism; but that that form of government which combines in itself an inviolable monarchy and popular representation, with the incitements and inducements of an aristocracy—a working aristocracy, an aristocracy that takes its share of shot in the day of battle, of toil and labour, of care and anxiety in the time of peace: an aristocracy of talent open to the people, who by talent and desert make themselves worthy to enter it—is the highest result of political science, the highest effort of the

mind of man. Let us see if the British form, apart from any details of its practice, combines in itself these three qualities. If we hold that authority and liberty are necessary to free government—that one is as necessary as the other—then we can apply the touchstone to this system, and see whether it be true to the mechanism on which it stands. The leading principle of the British system is that the head of the state is inviolable. It is necessary to the stability of any state that there should be an inviolable authority or tribunal somewhere, and under the British system that principle is recognised in the maxim that “the king can do no wrong.” It is necessary in any free government that there should be some power—either the head of the state or some other power—beyond which an appeal does not lie, an influence not subject to the caprice or whim, or even to the just complaint of the private citizen, contending against the state. This is necessary to prevent reform becoming revolution, and to prevent local abuses becoming the source of general disorganisation. Having placed the principle of inviolability there, and the principle of privilege in the peerage, the founders of the British state took care at the same time that the peerage should not stagnate into a stagnant well, an intolerable pool of pretension and arrogance. They left the device of the House of Lords, so to speak, with one gable—they left it open to any of the people who might distinguish themselves in war or in peace, although they might be the children of paupers, (and some have been ennobled who were unable to tell who were their parents,) to enter and take their places on an equality with the proudest there, who dated their descent by centuries. This inclined plane by which the people might rise to higher position was left open; and this provision was made in order that the peerage should not stagnate into an exclusive caste which could never be added to, or subtracted from, except by the inevitable law of natural increase or decrease. Then as to the English people, there have been great abuses as to their representation in the Government; but since the Reform Bill there has been pretty general satisfaction on this point, and a feeling that all classes have their fair

influence. This reform may be enlarged from time to time, in accordance with the spirit of the period; but a good proof that at present it meets general approbation and gives satisfaction, is that the party has not yet become by any means powerful that demands a more radical change.* Mr. McGee, having entered at some further length into a consideration of the elements that form the British system, went on to say that in forming the institutions of our country, we should compare this system with that which prevailed in the North American States, to ask ourselves which was the best. He observed that there was a strong democratic element in our society in Canada, but he felt satisfied from his own intercourse with the people that not three-tenths—he might say one-tenth, but he wished to give the widest possible limit—of them were what, by any stretch of the term, could be called democrats. He did not believe that this proportion existed, even if all who were really democrats at heart, but for various motives denied the designation, were to express their private convictions; and this included the whole, whether of French or other than French origin. Formerly the democratic spirit had been much more strongly exhibited in this country. We had made our Legislative Council elective, which in his opinion was much to be regretted. We had adopted to a certain extent the caucus and convention system of the United States, which even many Americans regarded as productive of so much evil, and which he thought had no advantage which should commend it to our approbation. We had also encouraged and sustained a democratic tone in our public press, and in some very conspicuous examples the press had a direct tendency to a low—almost the very lowest—tone of democratic opinion. He spoke of the public press as one who knew it well, and was proud of the rights it enjoyed. Fifteen of the best years of his life had been spent in almost every relation in which he could stand towards public journals. It was because it was desirable that the

* Here the reporter, for the sake of condensation, makes use of the third person, and so continues to the end.

public press should occupy that position to which it was fairly entitled, that he deplored the exhibition occasionally of a species of levelling, and a spirit of disregard for private rights and private decorum. Now the press, it appeared to him, ought to be a profession, as well as law or medicine. If medicine was important, if the maker of pills occupied an important place in the community, how much more important was the maker of opinions? The physician might destroy his individual patient; the advocate pleading at the bar might utter a fallacy, which the jury could detect or the judge correct, or which the opposite counsel might expose—at worst he would utter his words to impalpable air which closed over and crased them, and there was nothing irrevocable in such words. But the man without a conscience behind a printing-press had a power of multiplying his errors to an alarming extent. If such a man might give out at midnight his lie in relation to public or private interests, he might go home, lay his head upon his pillow, and perhaps bid his God good-night; and before the morning dawned the powerful engine, toiling while he slept, would have multiplied his lie ten thousand-fold, and sent flying over the country, east, west, north, and south, littering the land with libels and filling it with a fulness of falsehood which neither truth nor justice could ever overtake. Of all the professions and callings of our time, there was no man, not even the ordained minister of God, who exorcised such a fearful influence, whether for good or evil, in the perversion or formation of opinions, as the director of a powerful public press. And he was sorry to see, as he did not occasionally but frequently see in Canada, an imitation of the worst demagogic arts of the neighbouring States; for there might be a demagogic press, as well as a demagogic politician. He went on to say that not alone in the public press, but in other departments of public life, did he observe some of the evils of the American system—mentioning particularly the manifestly growing practice of lobbying being substituted for petitioning Parliament; but he expressed his conviction that the cause of constitutional government was gaining

ground every day, and that if the representatives of the people were true to themselves and to the people, it would be shown that there never was a community sounder at the core than ours, or one more ready to make sacrifices for the institutions which they prized. Returning to a consideration of the probable future of Canada, he said it was for the people of the country, with the precedent of England and the example of the American republic before them, to decide which should be the prevailing character of our government—British constitutional or American democratic. For his part he preferred the British constitutional government, not because it was called British, but because it was the best; and he rejected the republican constitutional, not because it was called republican, but because it was not the best. He pointed out that we were now witnessing a great epoch in the New World's history, and that the events daily transpiring around us should teach us not to rely too much upon our present position of secure independence, but rather to apprehend and be prepared for attempts against our liberties and against that system of government, which he was convinced was cherished by the great mass of the people of the Province. In conclusion, he said he left the subject with his audience. He had but sketched it in outline. He was embarrassed, not with the meagreness, but with the richness and fulness of the topic, and the amplitude of the material connected with it. He had already spoken in seven of the principal towns in Canada, and in the principal cities of the maritime Provinces, on the same text, and every time, of itself, it suggested something new. He only wished it had been presented in a measure better worthy of their attention: but at all events a subject more important and really deserving of contemplation, however treated, could not have been offered than "the Future of Canada."

BISHOP'S COLLEGE, LENNOXVILLE, C.E.

REMARKS MADE AT THE ANNUAL CONVOCATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
BISHOP'S COLLEGE, LENNOXVILLE, C.E., JUNE 27TH, 1864.

Your Excellency, Mr. Chancellor, Ladies and Gentlemen:—I must confess that when I accepted the kind invitation of the Chancellor of Bishop's College, and when yesterday I left Quebec, I had hoped that for a season at least, I had left the duties of a public speaker altogether behind me. Besides, Mr. Chancellor, though not wholly unaccustomed to being called to my feet at a moment's notice elsewhere, this is an occasion and a presence in which I should shrink from anything like unconsidered or ill-considered speaking. It may, perhaps, be doubted, if it is ever admissible for a man to speak without some degree of previous preparation—unless, indeed, he is forced to speak, as he may be forced to strike, in sheer self-defence. You have put me, sir, in that attitude, but I beg you to consider at what a disadvantage. You ought to consider whether or not I had my oratorical wardrobe with me. You ought to have considered that my thesis might be in my trunk at the Sherbrooke station. You will permit me, however, now that I have broken the ice (a most refreshing metaphor in this sort of weather), to enlarge for a moment on two ideas which were referred to by His Excellency in another place, and which have been fructifying in my mind ever since. They led to two trains of thought, one of which included the consideration of the material inheritance, and the other the consideration of the mental inheritance of the young men of Canada. When I am told that this College has not yet completed its twentieth year; when I consider that it stands almost within the

shadow of the ancient pines—which bowed to the same blasts that impelled Cabot and Cartier on their courses—when I reflect a moment on the riches which abound above the soil, in the soil, and under the soil of Canada, I cannot but think the merely material prospects of the young men of this country are prospects to be envied. And when I consider on the other hand our mental inheritance,—the conquering English speech, in which a man may travel round the world and find himself on no shore a stranger—when I think of the lived and hoarded wisdom of antiquity, made common to us all by the two magicians, moveable types and the steam press; when I remember that although much has been lost, a priceless amount has been saved from the wreck of ancient schools and societies, I must again congratulate the fortunate youthhood of these Provinces on their ample mental inheritance. One thing, also, ought not to be omitted; it is the glorious associations connected with our own home history. Patriotism will increase in Canada as its history is read. No province of any ancient or modern power—not even Gaul when it was a province of Rome—has had nobler Imperial names interwoven with its local events. Under the French kings Canada was the theatre of action for a whole series of men of first-rate reputation—men eminent for their energy, their fortitude, their courage, and their accomplishments, for all that constitutes and adorns civil and military reputations. Under our English sovereigns—from the days of Wolfe to those of the late lamented Lord Elgin (to speak only of the dead), our great names are interwoven with some of the best and highest passages in the annals of the Empire. We have not, therefore, a history simply provincial, interesting only to the Provincials themselves; but a history which forms an inseparable and conspicuous part in the annals of the best ages of the two first Empires in the world, France and England. I congratulate you, young gentlemen, natives of Canada, on that fact, and I trust you may years hence, at other convocations, when other dignitaries preside, and another age graduates, that you may be enabled to tell your successors how, even within your own time, a great

step was taken towards the consolidation and advancement of British North America in the good days when Lord Monck was Governor-General of Canada. Pardon me for having kept you so long, and be good enough to accept my most heartfelt thanks for your very kind and cordial reception.

PROSPECTS OF THE UNION.

REMARKS AT A DINNER GIVEN TO THE CANADIAN PARLIAMENTARY
EXCURSIONISTS TO THE MARITIME PROVINCES, AT THE DRILL-ROOM,
HALIFAX, N.S.,* AUGUST 14TH, 1864.

MR. McGEER said: Let me say at the outset that the idea of this visit did not originate with the Canadians; the credit of the invitation and the merit of its conception are due to the citizens of St. John and of Halifax, headed, in the one case by Mr. Donaldson, and by your Mayor in the other. In the next place it would be unfair if I forgot to state that to the great railway of Canada and its public-spirited directors is also due the possibility of our carrying into execution the design of visiting these Provinces, in what I fear you must feel to be rather an invading host.

Men have different objects of ambition; some wish to be great orators, others artists, others to be distinguished in the naval or military services of their country; but to be a good companion and a good fellow-traveller is surely a worthy ambition. There are some of our fellow-travellers, and some also of the sons of Nova Scotia, whom we all desire to hear, and I shall, therefore, make my speech very short. Though I believe I am a good comrade, yet I must say that I am afraid, judging from the present attachment of some of our company to this place, they intend to settle here, or else to deprive your city of some of its fairest treasures. I name no names; I trust that having given

* On an invitation from the Board of Trade of St. John, and the Mayor and citizens of Halifax, about a hundred Canadian gentlemen, members of Parliament, merchants, editors, &c., had spent a month on a tour through New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

this intimation of their design, you will take all proper precautions to preserve the peace of the city.

I will make one or two observations on secular matters, and first with respect to the public advantage to which this visit may be converted. I can say, as one of the persons representing one of the chambers of the Legislature of Canada, that we did not place any man under any political promise in asking him to join this excursion. There was no political design in the mind of those who sent the invitation or of those who accepted it. I am not myself here as a Minister of the Crown, but simply as a member of the Legislature; but I may say that I hope, and every person present must also hope, that before any great length of time passes we shall have a practical commentary on the intercolonial hospitality of which we are now the recipients. My fears are that we may move too slowly. We do move slowly in British America. In some respects it is our safety—in some cases *inertia* is an excellent trait of national character, and it might be excellent now if our neighbour's house were not on fire; but being on fire, slowness in trying to prevent the dangerous element reaching us is nothing else than the act of a maniac. The man who can shut his eyes and blind his thoughts to the circumstances passing around him, is unworthy to have a place in the councils of these free Provinces. I repeat, I fear that we may move too slowly—that we may be overtaken by the coming Northern storm—that we may waste our time—that we may lose the golden moment of opportunity—which, it has been well said, is given to individuals and nations once in a lifetime, and which, if neglected, may never come again. I will add frankly, my hope for a better policy is in the character of the gentlemen who will meet at the proposed Charlottetown Conference. I don't know how far it will go. It must be a preliminary meeting of course. If it places us a step backward, I shall be grievously disappointed; if it puts us a step forward, we shall be greatly encouraged. My hope is in the character of the gentlemen who will assemble,—in their desire to sink merely local questions. Who will oppose—who are now opposed to our union? Only those

who have a vested interest in their own insignificance. For, what is it we are called upon to sacrifice? Nations have been called upon often to sacrifice much for the sake of religious and secular liberty—year after year, generation after generation, they have sent out the flower of their youth to die upon the battle-field in order that the *patrie* might be saved. But what are we called upon to sacrifice? A few sectional prejudices, a few personal prejudices, some few questions of etiquette and precedence! These we are asked to place upon the altar of general union for the benefit of the whole. The metropolitan Power, with a wisdom which we might well emulate, has invited us to ask the union as a boon that we might have for the asking. Rest assured, if we remain long as fragments, we shall be lost; but let us be united, and we shall be as a rock which, unmoved itself, flings back the waves that may be dashed upon it by the storm. Let me appeal to the press and public men of these Provinces, as I would to those of Canada. Don't aggravate the difficulties that lie ahead. Don't magnify particular obstacles that stand in the way of the leading spirits of the different Colonies—as I must call those who have devised this Conference; for it is a Nova Scotia project, this idea of a Conference, in respect to Union of the Colonies. I appeal to the press to back up those who have the moral courage to look the future in the face, and are endeavouring to protect these Provinces against the dangers that threaten them. I have had some experience of political life in America—both in the Northern States and in the Provinces—and I think I can prophecy—though it is a dangerous ground to venture on political prophecy—that we shall never take a decennial census again, either as British Colonies or independent States, except we have an union of one kind or other.

Before I sit down you will permit me to say, in addition to what has been said by Monsieur Bureau who comes from Eastern Canada, and by Mr. McCrea who comes from the extreme west—from the borders of Lake St. Clair—that all of us, both those who are silent and those who speak, feel deeply the uniform kindness with which we

have been treated since we have been here. I have been here before, and that was one reason why I was so anxious to come again. My friends have consulted me, and I have told them that this is the ordinary kindness of Nova Scotia; and now, I think I may say for them, one and all, that their ambition is to be classed henceforth among your friends. You will permit me on their part to return our heartfelt thanks. From their Excellencies the Lieutenant-Governor, the Vice-Admiral, his Grace the Archbishop—from all classes of the citizens of Halifax, there has been nothing but one continued series of kindnesses since we landed here. That kindness was not merely local, it met us beyond the borders of the Province—in the persons of our friends, Mr. Pryor, Mr. Coleman, and Mr. Wier. They took the trouble to pass the bounds of this Province to meet us, and therefore I think I may say your hospitalities surpass all bounds.

Mr. McGee concluded by proposing the health of the Mayor and citizens of "Halifax the hospitable."

"SOME OBJECTIONS TO A CONFEDERATION OF THE PROVINCES CONSIDERED."

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT TEMPERANCE HALL, HALIFAX, N.S.,
AUGUST 16TH, 1864.

MR. MAYOR, Ladies and Gentlemen: Those whose opinions I have every reason to receive with deference, — those who, in this city, have ever been my kind friends, and who hold distinguished places among its citizens — have been pleased to say that an address on the subject which has been announced to you would be a useful and almost a necessary close to the Intercolonial festivities of the last fortnight. I have cheerfully yielded my opinion to theirs, and I am therefore to address you, on the subject announced — "Some Objections to a Confederation of the Provinces considered."

In the first place, Ladies and Gentlemen, I must solicit your kind consideration for whatever you may find defective in the treatment of a subject, so limited even as this is. The festivities of which we, from Canada, have been the objects for several days past, were not, as you may well imagine, the best possible preparation for the discussion of the most important public question ever submitted to the people of these Provinces. I should, I am free to own, have liked more time for uninterrupted reflection, but the commands laid on me were irresistible, and I am here, on short notice, to do the best in my power.

I shall come at once, with your leave, to the matter in hand — the much-talked-of Confederation. The proposal though not very new is yet not at all definite; it is therefore liable to all sorts of conjecture; all sorts of notions are afloat about it, and will continue to be afloat until the

scheme acquires something like consistency, when we may fairly look for two great natural parties, Unionists and anti-Unionists, ranging themselves on opposite sides of the broad field which will then be fairly open for our discussion.

At the outset I must observe upon the danger we all run of attaching some arbitrary existing meaning to the term "Confederation" itself. Of confederations there may be, and there have been, as many varieties as of consolidated monarchies. England is a monarchy—so is Russia; but how unlike! The Netherlands were a confederacy, with an hereditary head; Switzerland is a confederacy without any permanent head, hereditary or elective; the neighbouring States are a confederacy, with an elective head, supreme for his time over the army and navy and the administration of affairs. It is not absolutely necessary that our British American Confederacy—if it should be called into existence—should reproduce the American, the Swiss, or the Dutch model; we ought to be able—I trust our leading men are able—to strike out a new creation from the same fruitful source of free governments, to plant amongst us a new variety of the same famous stock, suited to our soil and congenial to our climate. Why should they not? What are the principal objections which have so far developed themselves? Two or three of the chief I will endeavour to state fairly and discuss fairly, and it will be for you to decide with what effect, for I believe I need hardly say to you, I am a friend and earnest advocate of a strong and speedy Confederation.

1. The first objection which meets one in society is very naturally this—the inherent weakness of Confederacies themselves, as illustrated in the failure of the South American and the disruption of the North American Confederacies. It must be admitted that the South American Confederacies were short-lived—were in fact mere abortions—that they died almost as soon as their existence was proclaimed; it must be confessed, too, that the great Northern Confederacy has been driven to submit to a dictator at the real presence of domestic danger; but, as I said before, Confederacies

are of many kinds, and the question, therefore, is many-sided.

Reasoning after the fact, it is easy to be wise, and reasoning on a familiar case, it is easy to be eloquent. The example of the Northern American States which, less than a century ago, were "sister colonies" of Nova Scotia and Canada, may serve as a guide as well as a warning to us. For the present purpose we will pass over the Spanish Republics, where there has been a failure of civilisation rather than a failure of the federal system, and we will consider only the familiar example of the States. They broke away forcibly from the body of the Empire,—I will not say without justification; but having broken away, the generation that succeeded this violent separation set their hearts upon making their society as unlike Europe as possible. Now, I will not pretend to say that we should desire to mould America—even if it were possible, which it is not—on the forms of Europe,—but I will venture to allege that Europe, in its positive Christianity, in its ancient learning, in its manners, and in its conservatism, presents to America many subjects for study, for imitation, and for admiration. When, therefore, the American Democrat of our century said in his heart, "I will make my country as unlike the rest of Christendom as I can," he said a vain and foolish thing, and his vanity and folly have brought their own punishment. Every one, of course, has his theory as to the disruption of that Confederacy, and you would probably like to hear my theory. Well, it is this: Every constitution we have any record of, placed the principle of infallibility, at least the seat of absolute last resort,—somewhere. In England, it is in the Queen in Council; in the United States, it was placed in the Supreme Court. When, by their local legislation, a large portion of the States themselves rejected the doctrine of the infallibility, the inviolability of their Supreme Court, when they broke down the very shrine of their constitution, the Government, with or without civil war, was overthrown. Now, supposing with this example before our eyes we were to form a Confederation, why should we invite at a future day a like

catastrophe? Why not rather engraft into our system the essentially British principle of investing with inviolability the executive head of the State,—the Viceroy, Duke, or Prince, who might be selected to rule over us? It is of the nature of an executive to be self-protective, and in according such a head all necessary powers, we but follow Nature,—a good guide, when well understood. I account for the failure of the American system to protect itself from domestic enemies, except by unconstitutional means, by the peculiar distribution and limitation of powers under that system,—not from the mere fact of its being a confederated rather than a consolidated Government.—But there is no possible compulsion upon us to make a similar distribution of powers. On the contrary, enlightened as we have been by late events, the natural result would be a Confederacy framed on different principles, in some respects, from the Republican Union.

II. Another objection commonly urged against a union of these Provinces is the heavy public debt of Canada. It is true we owe above \$67,000,000; but we are nearly if not quite 3,000,000 people; the assessed value of our real property alone exceeds \$100,000,000; our revenue this year, if I am well informed, will considerably exceed our expenditure; the average per head of our debt does not exceed yours in Nova Scotia, for your population; while half the millions we owe are solidly represented by our great public works, stretching from Lake Huron to the borders of New Brunswick. Though our debt is large, I do not admit that the burthens it imposes are unbearable, while I hope to show you on the other hand that the inducements we offer you to unite with us are neither specious nor inconsiderable. Under a common tariff we would offer you a three-million market; under the more intimate commercial system thus established we would offer to your young men connections and employments which no isolated Province can now afford them; through us you would secure your share in the future of that great North-western territory which Lord Sterling estimated capable of sustaining a population of 20,000,000 of souls. These are material

inducements to union ; but there is one of a nature rather less tangible, which yet I hold to be most important. As an element of our common security—as a contribution towards our mutual defence—it is impossible to attach too much importance to the moral effect of our union. Both on ourselves and on our neighbours the mere fact of our being united for purposes of defence would have a most salutary effect, and might go a long way to avert the attempts which might be made, with a greater prospect of success, against our estranged and isolated communities. As it is, we are bound up in each other's fate without being allied for each other's help—we are associated in danger, but not in preparation. If, therefore, I add the consideration of our mutual defence to the more material considerations of internal free trade, as an inducement to your union with Canada, I feel confident I am doing my duty at once to Canada and the Maritime Provinces.

III. A third objection arises from the vast extent of country which it is proposed to bring, for general purposes, under one general Government. I do not underrate the difficulties arising from the straggling and outstretched nature of our territory. But modern science has fortunately provided us a remedy against this evil—in steam communication. This invaluable means of communication is, of itself, a reason for union, since we cannot absolutely command its good offices without clubbing our capital. It is not creditable to any of us, nor is it worthy of the enterprise of the Empire to reflect, that if a Canadian wishes, for example, to visit the North-west, he must be indebted to an American enterprise, and pay tribute to an American route ; while if he wishes to visit these Provinces, he must, as we all have done, be under the same necessity of travelling over American soil, and sailing on American waters, to meet his fellow-subjects on the Atlantic ! This is a state of things which ought not to be allowed to continue, and which I am persuaded will not be allowed, if Mr. Fleming's Intercolonial Survey should prove, as I have reason to believe it will prove,—that the long-desired highway can be built for a reasonable sum such as these Provinces can shoulder. Upon the feasibility of that road,

I admit, the best answer to this objection depends,—an answer I will not anticipate; but if it should be favourable, I beg, gentlemen, you will observe, that it brings even the most distant constituencies of British America as near to each other, in time, as the Scottish constituencies were to London in the last century, or as the Irish constituencies were, fifty years ago, to the same centre of authority.

You will permit me now to refer to the general impression of many other difficulties in the way of confederation. I shall not go in detail into the discussion of these difficulties, but I will simply ask, as one of my Canadian colleagues did on a critical occasion, "What are statesmen for, if not to remove difficulties?" I have never heard—I do not think you have ever heard—of any state being founded or enlarged, or delivered from danger, except by surmounting difficulties. "But how to do it?" Some one will ask, "What is your plan?" "What do you propose?" I reply, for the hundredth time, here and elsewhere, that I do not presume to answer questions of this magnitude on my individual responsibility. I would proceed as our ancestors always proceeded, in such cases, by taking the *sensus communis*, with the sanction of the Crown, and I would not fear for the adequacy of the answer after common consultation.

There will, Mr. Mayor and Gentlemen, rest assured, be more than one Conference, before this momentous negotiation can be either completed or abandoned. What we want for the discussion of all the main particulars is our best men, irrespective of their party antecedents. "The cry of British America at this hour should be "Men! more men!" not merely an increase of number, but an increase in quality as well as in quantity. Let me illustrate what I mean, by a remote allusion. Alcæus, who, for the lofty truths he uttered, and the music of his utterance, was called "the divine," taught a free nation of antiquity, which, from smaller beginnings than ours, rose to fill a first place in history, that it was not in broad-armed navies, nor in battlemented walls, that the greatness of a state consisted, but in men, high-minded and brave, who knew their

rights, and how to preserve them. Here, where we are now assembled, another form of the same thought presents itself to me: time was, when your noble harbour, the pride and boast of all British America, was burthened only by the transitory shadows of the cloud and the canoe, where now we see such broad-armed navies ride as never were dreamt of by the divine Alceus. Its depths were as fruitful then as now—its tides as constant—its shores as sheltering; but the civilised man has succeeded to the savage, and even the face of Nature itself has changed, under the filial offices of her darling child—the European man. As in material triumphs, so it may be in political. Give us men—high-minded men—men who know their rights, and how to secure them—and we will change the moral and political aspect of British America as greatly and as beneficially as the physical aspect of the once barbarous Chebucto has been changed, since the foundation of the good city of Halifax.

And now, Mr. Mayor, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have, however imperfectly, complied with the wishes of many valued friends, who desired that I should say a few parting words to you on this subject. By this time to-morrow the waters of the Bay of Fundy will be between our kind friends and us;—before the end of the week, if it please God, we shall be back again in our Canadian homes, recounting the pleasant adventures we have had here and in New Brunswick. Will you permit me, before taking my leave, to utter one last word of appeal to the press and public of these Maritime Provinces? Before I may be able to visit you again, it is possible, nay it is probable, the fate of British America, for all time to come, will be decided. So certain am I that the present moment is decisive of our fate—so certain that elements hostile to our future existence as free, but not democratic States, are in active existence—so assured do I feel that the men who now sway our several councils must save or sacrifice our future fortune—that once more I would beseech all to whom my feeble voice may reach, not to embarrass this great discussion by minor issues. On the contrary, as was said of old, “a great

spirit becometh a great fortune."—I trust our press and our public men will exhibit now, in the crisis of our destiny, such a spirit, and that the Great Ruler of all things may, in His infinite wisdom, dispose the hearts of our statesmen to seek above all the true good of the people they govern, and to sink out of sight everything trivial and temporary, personal and mercenary, for the sake, the sole sake, of our glorious British America—for the sake of justice, and peace, and freedom, and Christian civilisation. If, in conclusion (said the hon. gentleman)—if we are indeed of the race who began that work of civilisation twenty centuries ago in the British Isles, in a soil originally so unfavourable, with implements so inferior to what we now possess, and who from such beginnings have worked out such stupendous results—if we are worthy to represent that race—then we shall repeat on a larger scale, commensurate with the largeness of the basis on which we are to raise our structure, the constitutional triumphs of that race, in reconciling liberty with law, in domesticating justice with freedom, in crowning a fair and venerable authority by the voice and hand of an intelligent, self-governed population.

THE CAUSE OF THE QUEBEC CONFERENCE.

SPEECH AT THE DÎNÉER GIVEN TO THE MEMBERS OF THE QUEBEC CONFERENCE, AT MONTREAL, OCTOBER 29TH, 1864.

Mr. McGEE said he had no intention at that late hour, and after their long sitting in Conference that afternoon, to detain them. When they were in the Lower Provinces their hospitable entertainers, many of whom they were glad to see to-night, were, on all occasions, pleased to hear Canadians speak and themselves to listen. He thought, as far as he (Mr. McGee) was concerned, he would best discharge his duty in showing himself a good host by being a good listener. However, as the Canadian politician who earliest made the acquaintance of some of the gentlemen now here, as one who had been, in an humble way, a pioneer of this gathering of the British North American family, he could not, as the only one of the members for Montreal present at this moment, who had not spoken, allow the meeting to separate without giving his hearty endorsement to every word of welcome addressed from the chair and by the various speakers to their friends from the coast Colonies. They were welcome to Canadians as fellow-subjects long estranged from them, and now, he hoped, about to be united. They were welcome to Canadians on their own account, as accomplished gentlemen, and of their accomplishments and powers the meeting had had this evening some evidence. They were still more welcome to Canada on account of the colonies of Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and of the communities there which they represented. As far as he was concerned, he would make no mystery of what brought them here, or of the business with which they were en-

gaged. They were doubly welcome, to himself, as one of the representatives of the first city of British North America, for the work of union in which they were now engaged. He was told that some of the citizens had often asked, Why this Conference at Quebec with closed doors? Why all this mystery; why this gathering together from the ends of British America of all the leading public men? Why were the several Governors of the Provinces eastward deprived of the benefit of the advice of their responsible advisers, that they should be thus gathered together at Quebec holding close council together? Parties said they elected these gentlemen to administer the government and laws as they exist, and not to frame new constitutions. Why, it was asked, had these gentlemen come here to sketch out, as was reported, the lines of a new constitution? If asked the reason why, he would give the reason in one word, the same which the visitor to St. Paul's was called upon to read on searching for the monument of Sir Christopher Wren—*circumspice!* Look around, and they would see the reasons for this gathering. Look at the valleys of Virginia, at the uplands of Georgia; look around in this age of earthquake and political perturbation in North America. Look at the men in these Provinces who were called its statesmen, whom Great Britain had warned solemnly and repeatedly through the press and Parliament, and by direct official notification, that if the Provincials did not provide adequately for the exigencies of their present new condition, England would hold herself blameless for the consequences. Why, she had given us all warning that things could not go on in future as in the past. If they wanted to see reasons for the present Conference let them look across the border, and they would find reasons as thick as blackberries why they should meet as they did and engage in the work which had for some time occupied them. It was now necessary, having gone so far, that they should have with them the cordial and united support of the public opinion and the public voice of the great city of Montreal, the heart and brain of Canada. He trusted, too, they would have the support of the majority of

all the intelligent people of Canada, of whatever origin, creed, or race. This was not a time for questions about creeds, or origins, or races, but a time either to save or ruin British North America. If its fate were not decided within this decade by its own act, in one sense assuredly it would be, and perhaps not to their satisfaction. If the thirty-three delegates had presumed to go into the Chamber in Quebec to sketch an outline to be submitted to Her Majesty in Council and the Imperial Parliament, before which submission it was not right it should be submitted in any kind of detail to the people of these Provinces—if they had gone into that room in a time of profound peace to sketch a new basis of constitution for these Provinces—they found their justification in the circumstances, in the peculiar position, in which the British American Colonies stood towards Republican North America, and in the intimations, official and unofficial, respecting our duties as to self-defence, conveyed to us for the last three years from the most undoubted sources—from the Government of the Empire itself. The Conference had acted, not in an empirical spirit—they had not gone into Council to invent any new system of Government, but had entered it with a reverent spirit to consult the oracles of the history of their race. They had gone there to build, if they built at all, on the old foundations. They desired not to build an edifice with stucco front and lath and plaster continuations, but a constitutional edifice upon a basis of solid British masonry, solid as the foundation of the Eddystone Lighthouse, which would bear the whole force of the democratic winds and waves, and the corroding political atmosphere of the New World, and which they hoped would stand for ages, a vindication of the solidity of their institutions and of the legitimacy of their origin. In their (the British N. A.) political architecture, he trusted they would vindicate the honour of the races from which they sprung, the Norman, the Saxon, the Celt, the homely, vigorous, fearless Scandinavian, and all the races that had gone to make up the great concrete called the population of the British Empire. He trusted that the British N. A. political architecture

would not be a plagiarism of republicanism, and not fulfil the predictions so freely showered upon them by some of the New York journals, that the proposed union would be simply democracy in disguise; but that we should not only acknowledge the monarchical principle, but construct an edifice with British connection as the corner-stone, and freedom as the main wall of the structure; and make the people feel their freedom was connected with a due respect for authority and the throne, as well as for those who represented here authority and the throne. In answer to the well-wishing editor of the New York *Albion*, who had cautioned Canadians against premature rejoicings over the degree of success they had attained, as they had done with regard to the laying of the Atlantic telegraph cable a few years ago, he (Mr. McGee) would venture to assure the editor they had not been experimenting and sounding out of their depth as those who laid the cable did. The members of the Conference had not been together so far without having a fair indication of what each other's opinions and sentiments were. They wanted no electrical stimulus from England, having only to touch *Magna Charta* and the Bill of Rights to receive all the inspiration or impulse they wanted in their present labours. So long as they had that electrical inspiration in their libraries, at their sides, they would always know what was thought in England of the work they had been doing at Quebec. In going back to their constituents, he said to their honoured guests, not as an Upper Canadian or as a Lower Canadian, for he had always said the Province line was abolished before he came to Canada, and if it was never drawn again till he drew it, either socially, politically, or any other way, it would remain undrawn long enough—he said to them, not simply as a citizen or representative of Montreal, nor even as an inhabitant of Canada, but as one who desired, and had laboured, in his humble way, to bring about this very spectacle which they to-night witnessed—he would say fearlessly and unreservedly on the part of Canada, that Canada, he firmly believed, sought this alliance, not from mercenary motives, but from a sentiment of common de-

fence. If they, on their part, came into this union, as he thought they would, well dowered and in such a manner that no one of the partners could ever upbraid them with their having come in a subordinate position—they could say that if Canada desired this union, which he believed she did, although the public mind of the country was not yet fully formed upon the subject, she went into it for no selfish, small, or mercenary purpose; and they could say for the public intelligence of Canada, and especially for the city of Montreal, that we were year by year, and every year, becoming more enlarged and liberalised in our views; that we were becoming less angry and hostile as sects and classes; that we were becoming better friends, and that now all men agreed that we could go where we liked on Sunday, or nowhere at all, if we liked that better; but that, at all events, on week-days, in our business and social relations, we bore ourselves as one people, with one heart and mind, for the commonweal. They could say that in Canada religious bigotry was at a discount; and if they wished for illustration, he could point his finger and show where the bigot had withered on his stalk, and where once he had a great show of power and influence, now were "none so poor as do him reverence." Bigots of all kinds, Catholic as well as Protestant; bigots of all classes, on all sides; bigots of race, who believed that no good could come out of the Nazareth of any other origin but their own,—their day of small things—God knew how small—had passed for ever in Canada. Every man was willing to respect every other man's convictions. We had, at least, reached that degree of self-government, and shown ourselves to be in the best sense civil and religious freemen, fit for self-government, by allowing every man of every creed and sect and race to manage his own affairs in his own way, and to wash his own dirty linen in his own back-yard, so that it did not trouble the neighbours or disturb the peace of the community. He thought their guests from below might assure their neighbours when they returned, that if they united with us they would find all that in Canada—religious combined with political liberty. He was sorry they had been

so long confined in the political laboratory at Quebec that they would not have time before the necessities of the season compelled them to return to their homes to see what went to make up this great Province—great in resources, great in extent, but greater still in the promise it seemed to hold out, that here in British North America we should establish true freedom—not freedom fair without but foul within, but that true freedom that gave every man his private and personal rights, consistent with the private and personal rights of others. They might say to their constituents, that if Canada went into this union she went into it mainly with a view to promote the common prosperity, to secure the common safety, and to establish the common liberties of all British North America.

GROWTH OF MONTREAL, AND ITS REQUIREMENTS.

A FEW REMARKS TO THE MONTREAL CALEDONIAN SOCIETY,
OCTOBER 30TH, 1863.

MR. MCGEE, after some humorous remarks in relation to the hall (the "Crystal Palace"), said: I quite agree with my honourable friend, Mr. Ferrier, that meetings of this description are fit subjects for congratulation; for surely nothing can be more agreeable than to see large assemblies conducted with the utmost order—than to see Care forget its burthen, and Old Age grow young as the night wanes on, and Memory going back to our earliest and happiest recollections, playing the physician's rather than the tormentor's part. I have myself seldom missed attending any of these secular festivals, and I cannot feel that an evening is thrown away when it is spent in observing and in sharing the recreations of large classes of our fellow-citizens. The character of our countrymen of French origin for gaiety of heart is proverbial throughout America, and I cannot, for my part, see any reason why, on an occasion, a Scotchman or an Irishman may not be as gay as a Frenchman. Lower Canada is remarkable for many things—for long winters, sudden springs, and rapid vegetation,—long may it be spoken of also as the home of a happy and united people, in whatever language they may meet to exchange their congratulations. It is well for us to know, as we now do for certain, that there is gold on the Chaudière and antimony on Lake Nicolet, but it is even better still to feel, as I do standing here to-night, that there is a growing feeling of brotherhood among our whole population—that there is a sense of security and a day-spring of gladness in the

hearts of our people. I speak now especially of Montreal, in the social economy of which the Caledonian Society plays an important part, and might be made to perform even a more important part. This Society provides its members during the summer months with free admission to the gymnasium of our deserving townsman, Mr. Guilbault, and, if but for this privilege alone, I wonder there should be a young Scotsman in the city who does not belong to it. If all those who might and ought to be were members of the Society, I have no doubt that in other directions, as well as works of charity and athletic exercises, the usefulness of the Society would be co-extensive with the city. All the sister societies represented on this platform ought to grow as the city grows, and we are apt to boast that no city on the Continent is growing more steadily and solidly than Montreal. I should wish for my part to live to see it extend from Hochelaga to Lachine, but not simply to idolise its vast dimensions. I prefer the gods of the Greeks, nearly of human size, to the gigantic gods of Assyria; and a city is no more worshipful for the number of acres it covers—or the size of its cemeteries—than an idol from Nineveh for being forty feet high. I would desire to see our city (for its character is in the crucible) provide itself with all possible appliances of physical and mental culture, as well as grain elevators and street railways. With 120,000 inhabitants, an opera house, a public library, and a gallery of art ought very soon be within our means, for without books, music, and pictures, neither the eye, nor the ear, nor the understanding of man is of much more value to civilisation than the senses of dead generations are to the people of the living age. Pardon me, Mr. President, for speaking so serious a speech at your festival, but we have had our laugh both at the “dippers” and the “snappers,” and I know that a plea for blending the *utile* with the *dulce* is never out of place in a society of Scotsmen. A word or two now upon the modern uses of this festival of Hallowe’en, which Burns has immortalised in verse, and MacIise upon canvas. The ancient superstitious rites which the bard has celebrated have vanished

one by one out of the by-ways even of the old world; but the old, good, kindly, neighbourly feeling—the old hereditary humour, the old love of social enjoyment—remain, I hope, unimpaired and unchanged. The original of the scene that Burns drew was a Scottish peasant cottage of the middle of the last century—

“Among the bonnie winding banks,
Where Doon rins, whimplin, clear,
Where Bruce ance ruled the martial ranks
An’ shook his Carriack spear.”

While the scene we witness here to-night, which owes so much to the spell of his genius, is contained within what we are apt to call, a little magniloquently, our “Crystal Palace,” without any of the romantic surroundings or historical associations of the original. But I trust we are not less happy in our lot here, in the new country in which that lot has been cast, than were the “merry, friendly, kintra folk” whose pranks and joys he so heartily approved.

THE GERMANS IN CANADA.

ADDRESS TO THE GERMAN SOCIETY, CITY CONCERT HALL, MONTREAL,
DECEMBER 7TH, 1864.

MR. MCGEE said: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, —My friend Mr. Lomer has been kind enough to devolve upon me the principal part of the duty of addressing you, according to an established local custom in Montreal on these occasions. He has spoken for himself and for the German Society; and while I fully agree with all he has said as to the importance of such a society for the protection of the immigrant and the promotion of German interests generally—while I cordially concur in the satisfaction he has expressed at the excellent understanding which exists among all our national societies (and long may that good feeling continue)—I am sure he will allow me to say that, so far as I am informed, I consider the Grand Trunk Company acted well and wisely in voluntarily settling, instead of litigating, all the claims that could be brought against them arising out of the recent deplorable accident to German immigrants at Belœil.* I think the German and other societies also did well in concurring in that settlement. I think it was well they were present, acting in concert, and I must again express my sincere hope that their cordial good understanding may always continue. While we see and deplore in the chief city of Upper Canada, Toronto, hostile societies organised and, it is said, armed against each other, striving, as it would appear, who should do most to disturb and exasperate

* By the opening of the drawbridge at Belœil, in which some ninety lives of German immigrants had been sacrificed.

each other, let it still be our pride and boast that our Montreal societies, of whatever origin or whatever religion, are rivals only in acts of benevolence and efforts at improvement. The firmness and forbearance of a few individuals on both sides might have given Toronto the same cheering tale to tell that we have here; and I must say, for my own part, that those in Toronto who have most influence with their fellow-citizens, and who allow a great city like that to drift into a chronic state of strife and hatred, have much to answer for. In this city we have had and now have, and always must have, our differences; but I am quite sure that any armed combination against any portion of our fellow-citizens, any combination against private or associated rights, and therefore against the law of the land, could, in the present temper of Montreal, be put down in forty-eight hours. I wish it were so in Toronto. I hope it may yet be so. It ought to be so; and if the men of real influence in Toronto said the word, it would be so. You will allow me also, I hope, to express my acknowledgments to Professor Simon, whose musical accomplishments I have long been familiar with, for the surprise he has given me in introducing some old words of mine to his exquisite music, and to Herr Brandt, for the true feeling and taste with which (if I may be permitted to say so) he has rendered both words and music. I turn now to another topic, the proper topic of the evening—the German Society of Montreal, or rather the Germans in Canada. I have enjoyed the warm, whole-hearted hospitality of the chief German settlement in Canada, in the county of Waterloo, when they were represented by my able and truly liberal-minded countryman, the Hon. Mr. Foley, who, I regret to say, is no longer in public life in this country. I have seen the flourishing German settlements of the United States, from Pennsylvania to Wisconsin, and knowing the universal character of those settlers—their patient industry, their peaceable demeanour, their power of endurance, and their love of freedom—I have naturally desired to see a large increase of German immigration to this country. The Fatherland, with its fifty

millions, must, in the future as in the past, throw off a large annual efflux of its hardy and docile population. Whether that efflux finds its way to the Ocean by the Elbe or the Oder, or the Rhine, from north or south or centre—from Catholic States or Protestant—I only wish we could attract them to our shores, and keep them here, at something like the same rate as they do in the United States. And why do we not? Because, in the first place, the name of Canada is not as familiar to the Germans at home as the larger and louder sounding name of America; because at Hamburg and Bremen, at Antwerp and Amsterdam, the name of Montreal is not as familiar as the name of New York. And we shall continue in a great degree to labour under this disadvantage until the great work in which our public men have recently been engaged—the union of all British America—is successfully accomplished. Then British America will be large enough; its field of labour will be diversified enough; its name will sound distinctly enough in the Old World's ear, to divide with the United States the attention of the emigrating classes all over Germany. One other thing we want, to bring about this result, and that is a fair and generous estimate of the German mind and the German character. A Celt myself, I should be the last man living to admit an innate inferiority in the Celtic race to any other; but I admit disparity, dissimilar gifts, and dissimilar powers. I hope I am sufficiently a citizen of the world to see and acknowledge the strong points of the German character, to admit the great services rendered by them in art and letters—in practical as well as in speculative science—to the rest of the world. Nothing used to astonish me more in the United States than the popular error that, to use the popular phrase, "the Dutch" were an unintellectual people. It used to remind me of the old story of the practical joke played off early in the last century, by a Prince of Württemberg upon his acquaintances in Venice, while Venice was yet proud and free of Austria, who had indulged very freely in disparaging his countrymen. He invited them to supper, and afterwards to a theatrical entertainment. This

piece, got up for the occasion, represented a street in Venice, with a solitary lamp burning at a door. The ghost of Cicero was discovered flitting in and out of the shadows, when a German traveller entered, and endeavoured to get admittance to the lighted house. Failing to get in, he pulled out his watch to learn the hour; he then took out a printed book and began to read by the lamp; till, at last, becoming impatient, he drew his pistol and fired in the air to awaken the Italians. At this the ghost of Cicero, who had watched all the German's movements, asked for explanations, which were given; and then Cicero demanded, if the barbarians of the north had, since his age, invented the timepiece, printing, and gunpowder, what had the Italians invented? And at this point a Savoyard entered on the scene, crying out, "Heckles! Heckles! Heckles!" This was a very proper rebuke to the arrogance of that particular company, though it was far from just to the Italians as a people. If we are to succeed in forming a new Confederation of the North, in establishing a free and united Monarchy upon the basis of these separated Provinces, we shall only do so by being just to all men, of every origin, speech, and creed, who may desire to come amongst us, to aid in that great work. The general idea of a Confederate government is already familiar to the German mind, from your experience in Switzerland and the Netherlands, and the German Confederation proper—though the last one is rather a league than a union—a *Staatenbunde* than a *Bundesstaat*. It is an idea which combines what the Germans have always cherished—freedom, with what they have always striven for—unity. Not only by its grandeur and prestige but by its security, is it well calculated to attract and interest a thoughtful people, whose migrations, judging from the fruitfulness of the stock, are as yet far from the end. If we may infer the part they are destined to play from the part they have played, then we could wish our country no better gift, than a large infusion of the Germanic element. On this point, if you will allow me (as to the past), I will refer to one of the greatest names of our times, the late Dr. Arnold of

7
ADDRESSES ON VARIOUS PUBLIC OCCASIONS. 121

Rugby, one of the most thorough and most fearless readers of history since Niebuhr's death. In his inaugural address as Professor of Modern History at Oxford, delivered in 1841, Dr. Arnold showed that Christendom in the fourth century possessed all the intellectual treasures of Greece, all the political wisdom of Rome, and all the ethics of Christianity, but it wanted the German element; that the Middle Ages bore an undoubted German character; that the influence of this element was still felt, and would long continue to be felt, "for good or for evil, in almost every country in the civilised world." As we pretend in British America to belong to the civilised world, and as I believe that influence which Dr. Arnold describes would be for good, I repeat my hope and expectation, that the new era in our internal government may prove a new source of attraction to draw and to settle large numbers of Germans in our future Confederacy. Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, I will not dwell further on these topics, because though they are above all party politics, still I do not wish to obtrude even general politics on any occasion not specially set apart for such discussions. I thank you most gratefully for your very cordial reception, and I congratulate myself on being in the city, and being able to be present at and to take part in this first public festival of the German Society of Montreal. You have made a good beginning, gentlemen, and I can only say, what we all shall be saying two or three weeks from now, that I wish you, from my heart, "many happy returns" of your benevolent festival.

SPEECH AT COOKSHIRE, COUNTY OF COMPTON, DECEMBER 22, 1864.

ON THE OCCASION OF A PUBLIC DINNER TO MR. J. H. POPE,
MEMBER FOR COMPTON.

HON. MR. MCGEE said: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, I promised my respected friend, your county member, Mr. Pope, to meet him at the recent public dinner given to my colleague, Mr. Galt, at Sherbrooke, and to come over here with him to Compton to speak to you on the subject of British-American Union. I was, greatly to my regret, prevented, by a sudden and sharp illness, from being present at the Sherbrooke dinner; for there is no public man in Canada whose services to the Union deserve all honourable acknowledgment more than Mr. Galt; and there is no place in the country I had rather discuss this question than in "the Eastern Townships." * I am here to make good your member's promise in my behalf, and I am deeply thankful that I am able to be here, and have still a voice to raise in behalf of this cause. This is a border county—it is a county actually undergoing colonisation—it is the home of a mixed people, various in origin, in language, and in creed; and, therefore, a very fit place to consider propositions which must interest men of all languages, origins, and creeds, which involve all our future relations among ourselves and with our neighbours, internal and external. So far as I can help it, gentlemen, I will not trouble you with what has been said before by my col-

* The "Eastern Townships" form that portion of Lower Canada lying between Montreal and the American line. They were settled by "Townships," not by "Parishes," as in French-speaking Lower Canada.

leagues in the government at other meetings, but I will endeavour to give you my own views on the nature of the constitutional developments which have been projected by the late Colonial Conferences, to show on what principle the project stands, to illustrate by comparison and contrast the merits of our design, and to show, in closing, its special adaptability to our present situation as British American Provincial communities.

At the start I cannot but congratulate the people of all the Provinces on the fortunate conjunction of circumstances which makes this the best possible time for a searching examination and a thorough overhauling of our political system. When I was in the Maritime Provinces last summer—when the Conferences were still a thing to come—I appealed on behalf of the project to the press and the public there, that it should not be prejudged, and I must say I think a very great degree of forbearance and good feeling was manifested in this respect. But I should be sorry, speaking for myself, now that the stage of intelligent discussion has been reached, now that we have got something before us to discuss, that such a vast scheme should pass, if that were possible, *sub silentio*. So far from deprecating discussion now, I should welcome it, for there could not be, there never can be, a more propitious time for such a discussion than the present. Under the mild sway of a Sovereign, whose reign is coincident with responsible government in these colonies—a sovereign whose personal virtues have rendered monarchical principles respectable even to those who prefer abstractly the republican system—with peace and prosperity at present within our own borders—we are called on to consider what further constitutional safeguards we need to carry us on for the future in the same path of peaceable progression.

And never, surely, gentlemen, did the wide field of American public life present so busy and so instructive a prospect to the thoughtful observer as in this same good year of grace, 1864. Overlooking all minor details, what do we find—the one prevailing and all but universal characteristic of American politics in those days? Is it not that “Union” is at this moment throughout the entire new

world the *mot d'ordre* of States and statesmen? If we look to the far South, we perceive a Congress of Central American States endeavouring to recover their lost unity; if we draw down to Mexico, we perceive her new Emperor endeavouring to establish his throne upon the basis of union; if we come farther north, we find eleven States battling for a new Union, and twenty-five on the other side battling to restore the old Union. The New World has evidently had new lights, and all its States and statesmen have at last discovered that liberty without unity is like rain in the desert, or rain upon granite—it produces nothing, it sustains nothing, it profiteth nothing. From the bitter experience of the past, the Confederate States have seen the wisdom, among other things, of giving their ministers seats in Congress, and extending the tenure of executive office fifty per cent. beyond the old United States period. From bitter experience, also, the most enlightened, and what we may consider the most patriotic among the Mexicans, desiring to establish the inviolability of their executive as the foundation of all stable government, have not hesitated to import, not “a little British Prince,” as I have been accused of proposing, but an Austrian Archduke, a descendant of their ancient kings, as a tonic to their shattered constitution. Now, gentlemen, all this American experience, Northern, Southern, and Central, is as accessible to us as to the electors of Mr. Lincoln or Mr. Davis, or the subjects of the Emperor Maximilian: it lies before us, an open volume, and invites us to well read, and mark, and digest its contents. It was with a view to contribute my mite at the present stage of the discussion, that I accepted Mr. Pope’s kind invitation, and am now here to offer you as clear a view as I can put into words, of the process of reasoning and observation by which those who composed the late Conferences arrived at the decisions at which they have arrived, in relation to the constitution and powers of government in the future Confederation. You have probably all read in the newspapers what purported to be the text—and it was very near the text—of the conclusions arrived at. You have no doubt all read Mr. Brown’s explanations at

Toronto, and Mr. Galt's further explanations at Sherbrooke; you have probably also seen two other expressions of opinion, on the general question, in the journals of the day, one from the Honourable Mr. Dorion, who is opposed to all union, except some sort of Federation of the Canadas; another from the Honourable Mr. Hillyard Cameron, who would much prefer a legislative to a federative union. I don't say that if it could be had by common consent, I would not be prepared to agree with Mr. Cameron; but a legislative union, under our circumstances, was simply out of the question. We might as well ask for the moon, and keep asking until we could get it. It was a question between some form of federative union or no union at all; and I am not at all prepared to say with Mr. Dorion—and never was—that the greater union is not the most desirable, if conditions can be settled satisfactorily to all parties. It seems to me—and in saying so I intend no shadow of disrespect to the honourable member for Hochelaga—that the man who can seriously maintain that union is not strength, that five or six comparatively small communities, owning a common allegiance, existing side by side on the same continent, in the presence of much larger communities owning another allegiance, would not be stronger and safer united than separate, that such a one puts himself out of the pale of all rational argument.

I will take as an instance of the irrationality of such an argument, the particular question, the great test question remaining between Canada and England—the question of defence. The future General Government has reserved to itself, saving the sovereignty of England, the control of our militia and military expenditure. Every one can see that a war with England and the United States would be largely a naval war, and such a naval war as the ocean has never before seen—a war that would interest and stir the heart of England even beyond the pitch that made her staid merchants astonish Lloyd's in 1813 with "three times three cheers," when they heard that the *Shannon* had fought and captured, and carried the *Chesapeake* a prize into Halifax Harbour. Suppose, then, in the event of an invasion of

our soil, either in Upper Canada or Lower Canada—suppose that a flotilla was needed on the St. Lawrence or on Lake Ontario; that England could spare us the gunboats, but not the skilled seamen; would it be no advantage to Canada to have the 50,000 Atlantic sailors of the Lower Provinces to call upon for their contingent to such a service? No doubt the Empire could call on them now, but unless it restored the press-gang it could not make them come. But if by our union we gave that valuable class of men the feeling of common country; if by the intercourse and commerce which must follow on our union, that feeling grew to the strength of identity, we would have enough help of that description—drawn from what my colleague, Hon. Mr. Cartier, calls the maritime element—for the asking. The Imperial power, having conceded to all the North American colonies responsible government, can only secure their co-operation, even in military measures, through those several local governments. Every one can see at a glance how much the Imperial power, and we ourselves, would gain in any emergency—if there were but two governments instead of five to be consulted—how much in promptitude, in decision, in time, in unanimity, and in effectiveness. I need not enlarge, I am sure, on so self-evident a proposition as this: the man that will not see it, will not; that is all I need add on that score. It has, indeed, been asserted by the sceptics in our work that all our theories of increased commercial intercourse are chimerical; and yet, oddly enough, these are the same people who think a commercial union would “secure all the benefits” of this chimerical prospect. Well, I will not meet assertion by assertion, but I will answer a conjecture by a fact. At the very time the member for Hochelaga was issuing his rather inconsistent declaration against a political union, as, among other reasons, wholly unprofitable in a commercial point of view, and in favour of a commercial union as all that was to be desired in itself, at that moment the first steamship, laden with breadstuffs, direct from Montreal to Newfoundland, was dropping down the St. Lawrence, as a result of the partial and brief intercourse

brought about between the two communities through our Conference at Quebec! That is a fact not very important in itself, perhaps, but very indicative of the possible usefulness of union in a commercial point of view! I may mention another fact: while we were lying in Charlottetown Harbour last September, our attention was called to the arrival of a fine ocean-going steamship—one of a regular line between Boston and Prince Edward's Island. The Boston people find the trade of that rich little island worth cultivating, and they do it. They know where there is produce and where there is a market, and they establish a line of steamers to run there; yet I am sure they sell nothing to the islanders which we, at half the distance, could not just as well supply them with from Quebec or Montreal. I repeat, however, I will not argue so plain a point as that, with provinces like ours, union is strength, is reputation, is credit, is security. I will just give one other illustration on this last head, and then I will drop the topic where it is. The security for peace which a large political organisation has over a small one, lies not only in its greater unity and disposable force, but in this other consideration, that the aggressor must risk or lose the benefit of much larger transactions in attacking a larger than in assailing a smaller state. If, for example, in our system of defence—in addition to all the Imperial Government could do for us—if we could, by our joint representative action, be sure to shut up simultaneously the River St. John upon the people of Maine, to exclude from the Gulf the fishermen of Massachusetts, to withhold from the hearths and furnaces of New England the coal of Cape Breton—no man can question but that we would wield several additional means of defence, not now at the command of Canada. And so with the Lower Provinces. If their statesmen could wield our forces and our resources in addition to their own, does any sane man pretend that would not be an immense gain to them in their hour of danger? (Hear, hear.) I may be told, again, the Imperial Government can do all this for us if they will: I repeat that the Imperial Government alone can neither do any of these things so promptly, so

fully, nor with so little trespass on our local responsible governments, as a united legislature could through an united public force, with the aid of a Federal treasury. I really, gentlemen, ought to beg your pardon, and I do so, for dwelling so long on the truism that union is, in our case, strength; but as the first proposition to which we all agreed at the first Conference, I thought I would give some reasons why we had unanimously arrived at that result.

Another objector opposes our project because Colonial Union is inconsistent with Imperial connexion. Well, to that we might answer that we are quite willing to leave it to the statesmen of the Empire themselves to decide that point. If England does not find it so, I think we may safely assume it is not so. And, in point of fact, the Imperial Parliament several years ago decided the question when they passed the New Zealand Constitutional Act, establishing six or seven local governments, under one general government, in that colony. Still another objector contends that the complement of Federalism is Republicanism, because most of the States with which we are familiar as Federal States are also Republics. But this objection is by no means unanswerable. It is true Switzerland is a republic in the sense of having no hereditary head, but the United Netherlands, when a Confederacy, were not a Republic in that sense. It is true the United States and Mexico, and the Argentine Federations, were all republican in basis and theory; but it is also true that the German Confederation is, and has always been, predominantly monarchical. There may be half as many varieties of federal governments as there are states or provinces in the world; there may be aristocratic federations, like the Venetian; or monarchical, like the German; or democratic, like the United States: the only definition which really covers the whole species of governments of this description is, the political union of states of dissimilar size and resources, to secure external protection and internal tranquillity. These are the two main objects of all confederacies of states, on whatever principles governed, locally or unitedly. Federalism is a political co-partnership, which

may be, and has been formed by Monarchists, Aristocrats, and Democrats, Pagans and Christians, under the most various circumstances, and in all periods of human history. There may be almost as many varieties of confederation as of companies in private and social life. We say, with propriety too, "the company at the hotel," or "the company who own the hotel;" but the organisation of each is widely different. Our Federation will be British: it will be of the fourth class of Lord Coke's division—for mutual aid. The only element in it not British is the sectional equality provided for in the Upper House—a principle which is known to be alike applicable to the democratic confederation next us, and the monarchical confederation of Germany.

One more objection which comes from an opposite quarter to the last, is that our plan is too stringently conservative. Well, gentlemen, I can but say to that—if it be so—that it is a happy fault, which we may safely leave to the popular elements of our state of society to correct in time. It was remarked long ago by Lord Bolingbroke—and a greater than Bolingbroke has called it "a profound remark"—that it is easier to graft anything of a republic on a monarchy, than anything of monarchy on a republic. It is always easy in our society to extend democratic influence and democratic authority; but it is not always possible—it is very seldom possible—ever to get anything back that is once yielded up to democracy. If, therefore, our plan should seem at first sight somewhat too conservative, I repeat my own opinion, that it is a happy fault, and the remedy may safely be left to time. So much, gentlemen, for what lawyers call the "general issue."

Mr. Chairman,—You will probably like me to define that particular adaptation of the federal system which has lately found such high favour in the eyes of our leading colonial politicians. Well, this definition has been, I think; pretty accurately given in the published text—or what professes to be the text—of the results arrived at at Quebec. Don't be alarmed: I am not going to read you the whole seventy-two propositions: it will be quite sufficient for my

purpose to give you, both by contrast and comparison, a broad, general view of what is and what is not included in our proposed constitutional charter. In the first place, I may say, gentlemen, to take the most familiar comparison, that we proceeded in almost an inverse ratio to the course taken in the United States at the formation of their constitution. We began by dutifully acknowledging the sovereignty of the Crown, as they did by boldly declaring their total separation from their former Sovereign. Unlike our neighbours, we have had no question of sovereignty to raise. We have been saved from all embarrassment on the subject of sovereignty, by simply recognising it as it already exists, in the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland. There, for us, the sovereign powers of peace and war, life and death, receiving and sending ambassadors, still reside so long as Her Majesty and her descendants retain the allegiance of the people of these Provinces. No doubt, some inconvenience may arise from the habitual personal absence of the Sovereign; but even this difficulty, now that the Atlantic is an eight-day ferry, is not insuperable. Next, we made the general, the supreme government, and the local derivative; while the Americans did just the reverse.

As to the merits and the consequences of this fundamental difference, I must observe this, that merely to differ from another, and a sometime-established system, is, of course, no merit in itself; but yet, if we are to be a distinct people from our republican neighbours, we can only be so and remain so by the assertion of distinct principles of government—a far better boundary than the River St. Lawrence, or the Ashburton line. But suppose their fundamental politics to be right, would we then, for the sake of distinction, erect a falsehood at the North, to enable us to contend against a truth at the South? Would we establish monarchy merely out of a spirit of antagonism? No! gentlemen, God forbid! I of course hold not only that our plan of government is politic in itself, but also that it is better than the American. I am prepared to maintain this at all times—against all comers: for if I had not myself faith in our work, I should scorn to inculcate its

obligations on the public. We build, as I said the other day at Montreal, on the old foundations, though the result of our deliberations is popularly called "the new constitution." I deny that the principles on which we proceeded are novel or untried principles. These principles all exist, and for ages have existed, in the British Constitution. Some of the contrivances and adaptations of principles are new; but the Royal authority, Ministerial responsibility, a nominative Upper House, the full and free representation of the Commons, and the independence of the Judges, are not inventions of our making. We offer you no political patent medicine warranted to cure everything, nor do we pretend that our work is a perfect work; but if we cannot make it perfect, we have at least left it capable of revision, by the concurrence of the parties to the present settlement, and the consent of the same supreme authority from which we seek the original sanction of our plan. Still it is to be hoped that the necessity for any revision will seldom occur, for I am quite sure the people of these Provinces will never wish to have it said of their constitution, what the French bookseller of the last century said so wittily, on being asked for the French Constitution, that he did not deal in periodical publications. We build on the old foundations, and I trust I may say, in the spirit of the ancient founders, as well. The groundwork of the monarchical form of government is humility, self-denial, obedience, and holy fear. I know these are not nineteenth-century virtues, neither are they plants indigenous to the soil of the New World. Because it is a new world, as yet undisciplined, pride and self-assertion, and pretension, are more common than the great family of humble virtues whose names I have named. Pure democracy is very like pride—it is the "good-as-you" feeling carried into politics. Pure democracy asserts an unreal equality between youth and age, subject and magistrate, the weak and the strong, the vicious and the virtuous. But the same virtues which feed and nourish filial affection and conjugal peace in private life, are essential to uphold civil authority; and these are the virtues on which the monarchical form of government alone can be maintained.

There was a time when such a doctrine as this, which I am now inculcating here, in Compton, could hardly get a patient hearing in any part of North America; but that time is fortunately passed away: it is possible in our days, even for republican writers to admit the merits of the monarchical system, without being hooted into silence, as the elder Adams was when he published in Philadelphia, towards the end of the last century, his eloquent "Discourses on Davila." His grandson and editor, the present able Minister at the Court of St. James', tells us how the printer was intimidated from proceeding with the publication, and that it was the great cause of his ancestor's life-long unpopularity; and for what? Because he maintained, with Burke and Washington, Bossuet and Shakespeare, the divine origin of society, as against the theory of its human origin, upheld by Jefferson, Paine, Rousseau, and John Locke. John Adams could be President of the United States, but he could not get a printer to publish a general treatise on government which admitted the merits of monarchy—which contended that there was "a natural aristocracy at Boston as well as at Madrid"—and the intolerant outcry then raised against him for the "Discourses of Davila" pursued him to the grave. Another American, of even higher mental mark than President Adams—perhaps the very first intellect of all the authors of the American system—was on the same ground equally suspected and equally abused; Alexander Hamilton, in his original plan of the American Constitution, offended in the same way as Adams by advocating "a solid and coercive union" with "complete sovereignty in Congress;" and we all know how, down almost to yesterday, his memory was branded as that of an enemy of the country he did so much to bring into existence. No wonder political science has been almost at a standstill for fifty years on this continent, when no man, however high his position, dared raise a negative to the prevailing democratic theories without permission of the clamorous majority for the time being. At last, and almost simultaneously, the negative has been raised at the extremes of North America—Mexico, and

Canada; and we, at least here, have no fear that our printers will be bullied into silence like the printer of President Adams. We have not conceived our system in a spirit of antagonism to our next neighbours; we will still have enough in common with them constitutionally to obviate any very zealous propagandism on either part; but we will also have enough left of our ancestral system to distinguish permanently our people from their people, our institutions from their institutions, and our history (when we shall have a history) from their history.

I have referred, Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, to the assertion of somewhat similar principles to our own now being made in Mexico. It would be strange if Canada should reach, by deliberation and forethought, the same results which Mexico has grasped at out of the miserable depths of her long anarchy. We are not yet informed whether the new Emperor designs to consolidate his provinces, or to leave them their local organisations; but this I know, that with all the immense natural advantages of Mexico, I should, for my part, rather take my chance for the permanent establishment of a free monarchy in the North than in Mexico. We have already solved for ourselves one great problem—the legal relation of Church and State—which is still before the rulers of Mexico. If we have but half the population, we have three times the number of men of pure European race that Mexico has; and while I own that I wish every success to the Mexican Empire, under the auspices of France, I have, I confess, still stronger hopes for the successful establishment of the free kingdom of Canada, under the auspices of Great Britain.

*"For bright, and fierce, and fickle is the South;
But dark, and true, and tender is the North."*

We have also solved, so far as the late Conferences could do so for these Provinces, the relation of the Crown to the people, the powers of the prerogative, and the sphere of the suffrage. We have preserved every British principle now in use among us, and we have recovered one or two that

were well-nigh lost ; we have been especially careful not to trench on the prerogative of the Crown, as to the rights, or rank, or income of its future representative on this continent ; as to the dignity of the office, or the style and title of the future kingdom or viceroyalty, or by whatever other name it may be Her Majesty's pleasure to designate hereafter her dominions on this continent. Next to the United States, we have the most extended suffrage in the world ; some think quite too far extended ; but in our state of society, I do not see how that is to be avoided, in the selection at least, of the tax-imposing House of Parliament. We have, besides, restored to the Crown one of its essential attributes when, as the fountain of honour, we leave to the Sovereign the confirmation of the second and Conservative Chamber ; and we preserve for the Crown its other great attribute, as the fountain of justice, by retaining its right to appoint the Judges, of course upon the advice of the Constitutional Councillors of the Queen in this country, who are in turn responsible to Parliament and the people for their advice and appointments. We have provided also, in our new arrangements, that the tenure of all offices shall be good behaviour, in contradistinction to the "spoils principle" of our next neighbours. In all these respects we have built on the old foundations, in the spirit of the old wisdom, and we have faith, therefore, that our work will stand.

Naturally, gentlemen, we cannot expect that our course will be all plain sailing. We must have our difficulties, as all states, new and old, have had ; and this brings me to refer to the apprehensions excited as to the local legislatures. The difference of language between the majority of Lower Canada, and the majority of the whole union is a difficulty ; but it is a difficulty which almost every other nation has had and has solved : in Belgium they have at least two languages, in Switzerland they have three chief languages—German, French, and Italian ; the Federal form of Government, the compromise between great states and small, seems peculiarly adapted to conciliate difficulties of this description, and to keep politically together men of

different origins and languages. I confess I have less anxiety on this score than I have on another—the proper protection of the minorities, as to religion in Upper and Lower Canada respectively. On this point there is no doubt a good deal of natural anxiety felt in these Townships, as there is among my own constituents in Montreal, and I dare say you would like me to enlarge upon it as the point most immediately interesting to yourselves.

I am, as you are, interested in the due protection of the rights of the minority, not only as an English-speaking member in Lower Canada, but as interested naturally and reasonably for my co-religionists, who form a minority in Upper Canada. I am persuaded as regards both minorities, that they can have abundant guarantees—sacred beyond the reach of sectarian or sectional domination—for all their rights, civil and religious. If we had failed to secure every possible constitutional guarantee for our minorities, east and west, I am sure the gentleman who may be considered your special representative at the Conference—(Hon. Mr. Galt)—and I am equally sure that I myself could have been no party to the conclusions of the late Conference. But we both believed—and all our Canadian colleagues went with us in this belief—that in securing the power of disallowance, under circumstances which might warrant it, to the General Government, in giving the appointment of Judges and Local Governors to the General Government, and in expressly providing in the Constitution for the educational rights of the minority, we had taken every possible guarantee, legislative, judicial, and educational against the oppression of a sectional minority by a sectional majority. You will have for your guarantee the Queen's name,—which I think the case of Ottawa has shown is not without power in Canada; you will have the subordination of the local to the general authority, provided in the constitutional charter itself, and you will have, besides, the great material guarantee, that in the General Government you will be two-thirds of the whole told by language, and a clear majority counted by creed; and if with these odds you cannot protect your own interests, it

will be the first time you ever failed to do so. The Protestant minority in Lower Canada and the Catholic minority in Upper Canada may depend upon it the General Government will never see them oppressed—even if there were any disposition to oppress them—which I hope there is not in Upper Canada; which I am quite sure there is not in Lower Canada. No General Government could stand for a single session under the new arrangements without Catholic as well as Protestant support; in fact, one great good to be expected from the larger interests with which that Government will have to deal will be, that local prejudices, and all other prejudices, will fall more and more into contempt, while our statesmen will rise more and more superior to such low and pitiful politics. What would be the effect of any set of men, in any subdivision of the Union, attempting, for example, the religious ascendancy of any race or creed? Why the direct effect would be to condemn themselves and their principles to insignificance in the General Government. Neither you here, nor the Catholic minority in Upper Canada, will owe your local rights and liberties to the forbearance or goodwill of the neighbouring majority; neither of you will tolerate being tolerated; but all your special institutions, religious and educational, as well as all your general and common franchises and rights, will be secured under the broad seal of the Empire, which the strong arm of the General Government will suffer no bigot to break, and no province to lay its finger on, should any one be foolish enough to attempt it.

This is the frame of government we have to offer you, and to this system, when fully understood, I am certain you will give a cheerful and hearty adherence. We offer the good people of these colonies a system of government which will secure to them ample means of preserving external and internal peace; we offer to them the common profits of a trade, which was represented in 1863, by imports and exports, to the gross value of 137,000,000 of dollars, and by a sea-going and lake tonnage of 12,000,000 of tons! We offer to each other special

advantages in detail. The Maritime Provinces give us a right of way and free outports for five months out of every year; we give them what they need, direct connection with the great producing regions of the North-west all the year round. This connection, if they do not get through Canada, they must ultimately get through the United States; and one reason why I, in season, and perhaps, out of season, have continued an advocate for an Intercolonial Railway was, that the first and closest and most lasting connection of those Lower Provinces, with the continental trade system, might be established by, and through, and in union with, Canada. I do not pretend that mere railway connection will make trade between us and them, but I am quite sure we can have no considerable intercourse, no exchanges or accounts *pro* or *con* without such a connection both for postal and travelling purposes. I rejoice, moreover, that we, men of insular origin, are likely to recover by this means one of our lost senses—the sense that comprehends the sea—that we are not now about to subside into a character so foreign to all our antecedents, that of a mere inland people. The Union of the Provinces restores us to the ocean, takes us back to the Atlantic, and launches us once more on the modern Mediterranean, the true central sea of the western world. But it is not only for its material advantages, by which we may enrich each other, nor its joint political action, by which we may protect each other, that the Union is to be desired; it is because it will give, as it only can give, a distinct historical existence to British America. If it should be fortunately safely established and wisely upheld, mankind will find here, standing side by side, on this half-cleared continent, the British and American forms of free government; here we shall have the means of comparison and contrast in the greatest affairs; here we shall have principles tested in their results, and ~~maxims~~ inspected and systems gauged, and schools of thought, as well as rules of state, reformed and revised, founded and refounded. All that wholesome stimulus of variety which was wanting to the intellect of Rome under the first emperors will be abundantly supplied out of our own circumstances and

those of our neighbours, so that no Cicero need ever, from personal considerations, enter into indefensible inconsistencies, and no Tacitus be forced to disguise his virtuous indignation at public corruption, under the thin veil of an outlandish allegory. I may be sanguine for the future of this country,—but if it be an error of judgment to expect great things of young countries, as of young people who are richly endowed by nature, and generously nurtured, then it is an error I never hope to amend. And here let me say, that it is for the young men of all the Provinces we who labour to bring about the Confederation are especially working; it is to give them a country wide enough and diversified enough to content them all, that we labour; it is to erect a standard worthy to engage their affections and ambition; it is to frame a system which shall blend the best principles with the best manners, which shall infuse the spirit of honour into the pursuit of politics, that we have striven—and who can be more interested for our success than the young men of these Provinces, who are to carry on the country into another century?

We in our time hope to do our duty; not only in “lengthening the cords and strengthening the stakes” of our constitutional system, with a view to that future, but in guarding jealously, in the perilous present, the honour and integrity of this province. I may say to you here, on the Eastern frontier, that the Government of the day are fully informed of all the machinations that have been set on foot, within and without our borders, to drive, or tempt, or trick Canada, out of that straightforward neutrality commanded by the Queen’s Proclamation four years ago. So far, we have been enabled to maintain that neutrality in the letter, as well as in the spirit, and I trust we may be equally successful in doing so, so long as it may be required of us. I am well convinced there is no Canadian who would wish his Government to make any base compliance—to overdo or overstrain any legal obligation—in order to buy for us the inestimable boon of peace; but I am equally convinced, and you will agree with me I feel confident, that all that can be done by way of prevention, however

onerous or costly it may be to us as a province, ought to be done to maintain friendly relations with our neighbours, so far as they will enable us to do so. The rest depends on them,—on the fairness of their statesmen and the discretion of their military authorities; but come what may in the future, at all events we must see that Canada does its duty, and its whole duty, cheerfully, fully, and fearlessly.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, I beg your forgiveness for the great length to which these remarks have detained you. But our general plan having already found its way to the public, I was anxious to show our countrymen, here and at home, in a plain, popular way, the processes of reasoning and the guiding principles by which we arrived at the results at which we have arrived. I should blush for myself, and grieve for my colleagues, if we were any of us capable of picking up our principles in a panic, without inquiry or reflection, or examination. I need hardly assure you, gentlemen, that nothing was done or said at Quebec or Charlottetown without full deliberation, and very hard work. It would be invidious to name names in connection with what was regarded by all engaged as a confidential discussion; but while I cheerfully recognise in our countrymen of the Lower Provinces the noble qualities they exhibited throughout the whole of these transactions, I must say, I was proud of Canada's part in them also. I was proud of the self-control, the ability, the acquirements, and the disinterested unanimity of our colleagues, from Upper as well as from Lower Canada. And now, gentlemen, that the architects have completed their plan, it is for you to say shall the building be put up? It is for you, and for your representatives in Parliament,—for my friend Mr. Pope and the other township members,—for the people of the Maritime Provinces and their representatives to say, whether this great work is to be carried, with all due diligence, to its completion. If the design should seem to you as wise and fit as it seems to us, then sling all misgivings far behind you and go ahead! Let no local prejudice impede, let no personal ambition obstruct, the

great work. Why! the very Aborigines of the land might have instructed the sceptics among ourselves that union was strength. What was it gave at one time the balance of power on this soil to the Six Nations,—so that England, France, and Holland all sought the alliance of the red-skinned statesmen of Onondago? What was it made the names of Brant, and Pontiac, and Tecumseth so formidable in their day? Because they too had conceived the idea—an immense stride for the savage intellect to make—that union was strength. Let the personalities and partisanship of our times stand abashed in the presence of those forest-born Federalists, who rose superior to all mere tribal prejudices in endeavouring to save a whole people. And now, my friends of the County of Compton, once more receive my grateful thanks; have no fears for the rights of the minority, but be watchful as you ought to be, and as I am sure your worthy member (who is always at his post when your interests are at stake) will be. The Parliament of Canada is, as you are aware, called by His Excellency for despatch of business at Quebec, on the 19th of January; it is an early call; and I am sure you all feel it will be an important session. I am, I do assure you, persuaded in my inmost mind, that these are the days of destiny for British America; that our opportunity to determine our own future, under the favour of Divine Providence, is upon us; that there is a tide in the affairs of nations, as well as of men, and that we are now at the flood of that tide. Whether the men who have this great duty in charge will be found equal to the task, remains to be proved by their votes; but for my part, I am hopeful for the early and mutually advantageous union of all the Provinces; for the early and firm establishment of our monarchical Confederation on this continent.