

Montgomery, at the outlet on Lake Champlain, \$100,000; for the forts at Portland and other places in Maine, \$700,000.

5. The resolution offered by the chairman of foreign relations of the Senate, looking to the abrogation of the stipulation in the Webster-Ashburton Treaty for the mutual surrender of fugitives from justice.

6. The bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. Littlejohn (January 19), for the construction of a ship canal around the Niagara Falls "of sufficient dimensions for the passage of gunboats and vessels of war."

The house will perceive that every one of these acts has taken place since the commencement of the year. It is impossible, then, for anybody to avoid seeing that, however unjust and unfounded it may be, a feeling of hostility and irritation has grown up in the minds of the American people, and a desire exists, whenever the fitting opportunity comes, to revenge what they considered the humiliation of the Trent affair, to retaliate for the offences of the St. Alban raiders, and the depredations committed upon northern commerce by ships fitted out in English ports.

This was that induced British statesmen to look with an anxious eye upon events that were transpiring around us, and which called forth this language from Lord Derby:

"Of these two measures (referring to the repeal of the lake armaments and the reciprocity treaties) it is impossible not to say that they are adopted in a spirit of hostility to this country. [Hear, hear.] One of them throws open questions of the most delicate and difficult character. The American people have derived, as they do not deny, great commercial advantages from the reciprocity treaty, and its termination is advocated only on the avowed ground that Canada derives still greater advantages. One effect of the termination of that treaty would be, if I am not mistaken, that the whole of the complicated question of the fisheries, from the settlement of which the United States have derived incalculable advantage, would at once be thrown open. [Hear, hear.] I am old enough to remember what serious complications and difficult questions connected with the fisheries occasioned, and how near to the point of war, they led this country and the United States; and now all these questions are gratuitously, and apparently without the slightest reason, thrown open at the risk and danger of war—that which, nothing could be more deplorable—between this country and the United States. [Hear, hear.] It is not a little significant, too, that at the same time, when the abrogation of this commercial treaty lays open all these points of danger and difficulty, there is another step taken to abrogate another treaty. For a long period the lakes have served as the means of peaceful and profitable commerce between the two countries lying alongside each other; but I can recollect a period in the late American war when there was a race of ship-building on the two sides of the lakes, and when the party obtaining the supremacy in that matter gained the control of the lakes. [Hear, hear.]"

When Lord Derby used these expressions in reference to two of these measures he did not allude to the resolution which is the fifth in the catalogue read, and which, in my opinion, exhibits a more determined feeling of hostility than any of the others. I allude to the notice to abolish the extradition treaty. Could anything be more significant of the extent to which these feelings had grown than the fact that a statesman like Sumner should, in his place in Congress, coolly contend that this treaty, the principle of which is regarded by all countries with any pretensions to civilization as a necessary safeguard for the punishment of crime, and which is founded upon the principles of common justice and humanity, should be terminated. This declares, in effect,

that a man who committed murder in Canada and fled to the United States, or who committed any similar crime there and fled here, should enjoy immunity from punishment of his crime. Surely no stronger evidence than this was needed to show how far the feeling he had alluded to had gone in the United States.

If then the fears to which I have alluded should unhappily be realized, in what position I would ask would we be in? On this point I shall call the attention of the house to the opinion of Mr. Cardwell, than whom no man is in a better position to judge, than whom no man has greater responsibilities, or would be more likely to weigh well the meaning of his words before he uttered them.

He uses the following language:

"I cannot express the feelings of regret with which I should view any controversy between the United States and the subjects of the Queen. I should look upon it as a calamity unequalled by anything the world has ever seen."

This then is the opinion of a responsible minister of the crown, as to what is likely to be the nature of that war if we should be led into it.

Truly then if those whose position and opportunities entitle them to be the best judges of the character of the war when it comes, entertain these views, it behoves us to make some preparation for so frightful a contingency whence it shall arise.

What provision, I would ask, do Englishmen consider ought to be made?

Hear the opinion of Mr. Foster who introduced the subject to the notice of the Parliament. He says:—

"The principle was becoming every day more established that the relations between this country and the colonies of British North America were very much on the basis of an offensive and defensive alliance between two self-governing communities united together by allegiance to one legitimate Sovereign."

What attitude then ought we to assume in reference to the new duties devolving on us.

Is it not natural for British statesmen to look upon the Union of the Colonies, as a means of defence? Do they not feel, have they not a right to feel, that the effect of Union would be largely to improve the possibility of defence?

It is a favorite argument against it to say that by Union, we will obtain no more money, no more men, and how is it possible then for Union to improve our position? It is true we have no more means, no more men, but what we have is concentrated, there would be one heart, one soul, one purpose, one controlling power, extending over the whole Confederation, from Sarnia to Sydney.

Suppose this argument had been used at the time of the American rebellion, that instead of concentrating their forces, and their means, each State had acted upon its own responsibility, does not everybody know, that instead of being able to maintain a war for seven years, against the greatest Naval and Military power in the world and then to establish their independence, the result would have been very different.

I hold in my hand the observations of a distin-