

besides, to help in case of war. (Hear, hear.) No, we are not to imagine that a war at this time would be a war of 1812, and the people know it perfectly well. If a Confederation like this which is now proposed is imposed upon the people without consulting them, and even against their will—if they are forced to bear a burthen much heavier than they now bear—and if the treaty of reciprocity is not continued—if a commercial crisis should ensue, and if war should break out between England and the United States, you must not suppose that the people will fight as they fought in 1812, when you have driven them to discontent, and rendered their position harder than it now is. You may toll off the population into regiments, and they will not rebel, because they are loyal and submissive, but their hearts will not be in the cause, and they will assuredly not fight with the same spirit as they would shew if they were defending a constitution and a state of things of their own choosing. They will not fight with the same courage as the southern rebels have shewn, for they were fighting to defend institutions—bad ones it is true, but which they were attached to, and which they were desirous of preserving. (Hear, hear.) In the event of a war with the United States, and being under a Confederation, the people would be called upon to defend a state of things which they dislike—a Constitution imposed upon them, to which they would not be attached—a Constitution in which they would have no interest. The war might result from a difficulty originating in China! They would be compelled to fight against a people whom they look upon not as enemies, but as friends, with whom they keep up daily relations; and, I repeat it, it would not be possible for them to fight as they did in the last war. (Hear, hear.) But I return to the Reciprocity treaty, and I say that we shall feel its great value once it has been repealed. It is like a bridge over a river between two parishes; so long as the bridge stands, every one takes advantage of it without a thought of its utility, but let the bridge be carried away or destroyed, and every one feels what an advantage it was, and the people realize the loss they have suffered, when they are once more compelled to resort to the old system of flats and boats every time they require to cross the river. (Hear, hear.) And if the Reciprocity treaty be repealed, it will be due to the conduct of several mem-

bers of the Ministry, and to the papers that support them, and which they support in return; it will be due to the conduct of Tory politicians and journalists in Canada, who, since the beginning of the war, have constantly done everything in their power to irritate our neighbors and to embroil us with them, by displaying misplaced sympathy. (Hear, hear.) For my part, Mr. SPEAKER, I know that the people of Canada do not ask for annexation to the United States, for they are in the enjoyment of peace and contentment as things now stand. The people do not desire any change; but if you wish to establish a new order of things, if you desire to create a new nationality, I fancy we have the right to say what we consider suited to us; and if you desire to establish a new kingdom on this continent, we surely are entitled to examine what it is to be, and the basis upon which it is to be erected. I say it would be a misfortune for us if we attempted to establish a system founded upon a political principle contrary to that of the United States—on the monarchical principle. If we must inaugurate a policy, let it not be a policy calculated to give umbrage, a policy of distrust and provocation. Let it rather be a policy of conciliation and peace. Let it not be a policy of armies, of useless walls and fortifications—a policy of ruin and desolation! What would be the use of all these fortifications, all these walls, if they load us with an unbearable burthen of taxation, restrict our commerce, paralyse our industry, shut us up within our own narrow limits, with our vast products cut off from a profitable market? (Hear, hear.) Do you fancy that the people would then care much whether the flag floating over them bore a cross or a stripe? The people are satisfied to remain as they are; they do not wish for anything better now; but if you desire to change their political relations, they have the right to examine your scheme in all its phases. They have the right to ask themselves whether what you offer them is not a permanent state of war for themselves and their children. (Hear, hear.) The Constitution of the United States is certainly far superior to that proposed to us, and far better suited to our habits and the state of society amongst us. This scheme of Confederation, this scheme of an independent monarchy, can lead but to extravagance, ruin and anarchy! You may decry as much as you choose the democratic system, and laud the