

monarchical system—the people will ever estimate them both at their proper value, and will ever know that which will suit them best. And when the farmers of Upper Canada are compelled to sell their wheat, after sending it to Montreal, ten cents a bushel lower than they now sell it at home, in consequence of the repeal of the Reciprocity treaty, there will be a general demand throughout the whole of Upper Canada, as well as of Lower Canada, for a change other than Confederation. And as to this point, here is what was said by a gentleman who, but a few months ago, held a seat on the Ministerial benches—I refer to the Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN. He said:—

The continuation of the Reciprocity treaty with the United States is favorable, not only to the farmers of Canada, and to all other classes through them, but also to the English Government; for, without the existence of that treaty, the Canadians are in a position to be greatly benefited, in an industrial and commercial sense, by the annexation of Canada to the United States, unless other industrial or intercolonial arrangements should take place.

Annexation is far preferable, in an industrial point of view, to our "free trade in raw products," which is unaccompanied by protection for home industry.

"Those who speak the truth to the people in times of crises like the present, are really the most loyal men," adds Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN; and he is right; therefore, it is that I take it upon myself to speak thus frankly and to tell the truth to the people. (Hear, hear.) "But," it will be said, "annexation is national suicide, and the people will never consent to it! Look at Louisiana, which has lost itself in the American union!" The people of Lower Canada will reply, that Louisiana contained but 30,000 whites when it was sold to the United States for \$14,000,000, and that Lower Canada counts more than 1,000,000 of inhabitants; that there is, therefore, no comparison between the position of Louisiana at that time and that we now occupy. Besides, those 30,000 whites in Louisiana were not all French; for thirty years previous to 1800, Louisiana had belonged to the Spaniards. No one can deny that. It was in 1803 that it was ceded by France to the United States, and yet its French population has not been absorbed and has not disappeared. (Hear, hear.) Since it was ceded to the United States, Louisiana has always governed itself as it liked, and in its own way. It is true that the official use of the French language

has been abolished in its Legislature, but why and by whom? It was abolished by the people of the country themselves, to mark their dissatisfaction at having been sold by France. But notwithstanding that fact, and the great influx of foreign population, the original population have remained French, their laws are published in French, the judges speak French, pleading is carried on before the tribunals in French, numerous journals are published in French; in a word, the country has remained as thoroughly French as it was under the domination of France. (Hear, hear.) To those who tell our people that annexation would annihilate them as a people, and destroy their nationality and their religion, they will reply that there is no danger of their being transported like the inhabitants of Acadia, and that Lower Canada would be as independent as any of the other states of the union; that they would, therefore, manage their own affairs, and protect their interests as they thought proper, without fear of intervention on the part of the General Government or of the other states; for they would possess, like all the other states, full and entire sovereignty in all matters specially relating to their own interests. They would be obliged to submit to the Federal Government only as regards matters of general interest, such as postal matters, the tariff, foreign relations, defence against enemies, &c., &c. With regard to local matters, they would be perfectly sovereign in their own country, and they could make all the laws they thought proper, provided such laws were not hostile to the other states. Thus, as regards the question of divorce, they might legislate so that divorce could not be effected within their limits. At present some of the states have divorce laws, while others have not; divorce is not permitted everywhere. (Hear, hear.) In the same way as regards the militia; the people will tell you that they might do like Vermont, which has formed part of the American union since its foundation, and which never adopted a militia law until January, 1864, because the political organization of the United States never rendered it necessary for the American people to maintain armies in each state in time of peace, and each state is perfectly free as regards the organization of its militia, provided it furnishes the number of soldiers assigned to its population, in time of war. (Hear, hear.) They do not ruin themselves in time of peace to organize the militia. A