

himself indignantly against the imputation of a wish to annex Central America to Mexico;" or take another article: "Hostilities have recommenced between the Empire of Brazil and the Republic of Uruguay," one of the States of the Argentine Confederation. "Paraguay, an ally of Uruguay, has also declared war against Brazil. The latter is assisted by the revolutionary party in Uruguay, under the orders of General Flores. A Brazilian fleet assisted by General Flores and the revolutionists of Uruguay, has burned Paysandu, the capital of Uruguay * * * so that Uruguay is torn at the same time by civil war and a foreign war." This is a lamentable state of affairs! How prudently ministers have acted in omitting all mention of these sad scenes, in asking us to vote for Confederation! They would have spoiled their brilliant picture by too great a depth of shadow. Passy, in his *Mémoire sur les formes de Gouvernement et les causes qui les déterminent*, (*Mémoires de l'Institut, Sciences morales et politiques*, 2e série, vol. 3,) expresses himself as follows, speaking of all these South American Confederations:

Seldom does a year pass, without fresh rebellions breaking out among them; very seldom do the heads of the governments reach the legal term of their functions. The presidencies are ephemeral dictatorships, the prize of generals who, exiles one day, are at the head of armies the next, while the states themselves sometimes confederate, again independent, are constantly changing their forms of government and their aspect.

PASSY assigns two main causes for these occurrences. The absence of homogeneity or common origin, and the want of knowledge. As to this want of knowledge, I must observe that there are few nations in the world, if any, the population of which is generally as enlightened as that of the United States of North America, and yet, at this very time, we see the dogs of civil war let loose among them and raging as fiercely as ever they did among the confederate governments of South America. As to the absence of homogeneity talked of by PASSY, if it exists to such an extent as to lead to these sad results among the confederations of South America, in which all the citizens are, without exception, Catholics, speaking the same language, and who all within a few years fought side by side against their common enemy, Spain, to achieve their liberty,—if they are deficient, I say, in homogeneity, what is the case with us? Protestants and Catholics, French, English

and Irish speaking two different languages. The strongest bond of union among the citizens of a state is a community of language and religion. We have neither in common. The confederations of South America have both, and yet, as PASSY says, they have not sufficient homogeneity to afford a hope that they can ever live in peace under a federal régime. Mexico was constituted a Confederation in 1824. In 1837 it was united, and the union subsisted till 1846, except three years of dictatorship. In 1846 the Federal principle again prevailed, but disappeared in 1853, since which period the history of Mexico is too generally known to need repetition in this place. It is written with the blood of its citizens. I shall merely mention the United States of North America. I do not pretend—I do not possess the ability—to trace out the real sources of the immense civil war by which they are now rent in pieces. Enough for me to say, that nobody is to consider slavery as the only cause of the civil strife. More than thirty years ago upon a question of tariff which went to protect the manufacturers of the North at the expense of the planters of the South, South Carolina sounded the signal of insurrection, as she since did in 1861; and had it not been for the firmness of General JACKSON, who overstepped his powers to save his country, the civil contest would have commenced at that time. It was sure to come on; it was only delayed for a while. These were all trials of the Confederate system.

MR. CORNELLIER—All the confederations which you have mentioned were or are republican, and had the common fate of republican institutions. You have not said a word about monarchical confederations.

MR. JOLY—I have made no mention of monarchical confederations, because none have ever existed, and none can exist. The principle of a monarchy is that the power resides in one person; the principle of confederation is that it resides in all the members of the confederation. A confederation would, therefore, always be a republic, even if formed of several states subject to a monarchy; because the power would not be vested in one person, but in each of the several states, of which no one would acknowledge a head; it would be a republic consisting of a very small number of members. Before I take leave of all the confederations, the names of which I have mentioned, I intend to say one word, at least, in their favor. We understand that states