

for the requirements of the Imperial Treasury had given rise to deep indignation on this side of the Atlantic. And that ill-advised colonial policy it was that lost to England her American colonies. Taught by this revolt, England perceived that she must grant greater political liberties to her French colonists in Canada. They would not withdraw themselves from English domination; on the contrary, they wished to remain under her flag, for they feared being drawn into the neighboring republic, the future greatness of which was not at the time foreseen. Impelled by the dread of losing what possessions remained to her in America, England had to yield the concessions which Canada asked for from her at a time when the war of independence called for the cooperation of the French element. GARNEAU says:—

When war with the English colonies in America was apprehended, prejudice was overcome in order to make the Canadians favorably disposed, by granting them the Act of 1774, known as the "Act of Quebec." This imperial statute, establishing a Legislative Council, entrusted, together with the Governor, with the duty of making laws, again guaranteed to us the free exercise of our religion, maintained our laws and our customs, and released the Catholics from the necessity, in order to become members of the Council, of taking an oath contrary to their religion.

This was what the war of the independence of the United States was worth to us. England saw that if she dissatisfied the Canadians there would be an end to her power in America, and then only did she grant to French Canada the Quebec Act, which was a step towards the obtaining of greater liberties. The other day, the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada read us several passages from our history, to prove to us that French-Canadian hands had alone prevented the annihilation of English domination on this continent. But he did not draw all the conclusions which he might have derived from the premises which he adduced, and the facts which he cited. He ought to have told us whether, in the face of those services valiantly rendered, it is just that the English element, supported by its number, should to-day impose upon us representation based on population; ought the English element, by this aggressive measure, to shake our loyalty to England by creating a system of government which is repugnant to us, and in which the French

element will lose its just share of influence in the administration of the affairs of our country? At this period it was that an address was sent to the Canadians by the American Congress, calling upon them to unite with them in the insurrection against the Mother Country:—"Seize," said the Congress, "seize the opportunity which Providence itself affords you; if you act in such way as to preserve your liberty, you will be effectually free." Mr. SPEAKER, everyone knows the reply made by the Canadians to this appeal. Armies invaded our territory, and took possession of a part of the country. Quebec alone held out, thanks to a garrison composed in part of French-Canadians. And if we are now sheltered beneath the folds of the British flag, it is to French-Canadians that we owe it, and it is them that England ought to thank. But if it is proposed now to thrust upon us a political system, the sole object of which is to submerge us in a hostile majority, we have to thank the English for it—the English for whom our fathers saved the country in 1775. After the defeat of the Americans before Quebec, Congress did not lose courage. A second manifesto was despatched to Canada, promising fresh reinforcements; eminent men even came into the country; FRANKLIN, CHASE and CARROLL in vain solicited the Canadians to unite with them. Dr. CARROLL, who died in 1815 Bishop of Baltimore, was sent among the Canadian clergy with no better success, and all hope of obtaining possession of this important colony had at last to be relinquished. These facts necessarily tended to enlighten public opinion, and England perceived that it would be better for her to comply with the just demands of the Canadian people, in order that reliance might be placed upon them in the day of danger, and that they might be used as a rampart against the United States. Then it was that a more liberal Constitution was granted to us, that of 1791:—

PITT, taught by the former faults of England in the administration of the United States, and by the great example of his father, Lord CHATHAM, presented to the House of Commons a bill for granting to Canada a new Constitution, sanctioning the elective principle and dividing the colony into two distinct provinces, Upper and Lower Canada. The bill, after undergoing some amendments (one of which was to increase the representation from thirty to fifty members), passed on a division in both Houses. The celebrated statesman BURKE, when giving in his assent to the bill,