

subject of union before the public, who have talked of and dreamed about it, who have desired it as one of the greatest boons, but who felt that such were the difficulties in the way no plan could be possibly agreed upon that would approach to a satisfactory adjustment. All thought it would sometime or other be accomplished, but none that the time for its discussion was at hand or that a solution of its difficulties was practicable. We hoped that a period would arrive when the leading minds of the different provinces might agree upon some feasible plan, but we hardly dared to expect that it would be in our time. And yet now, strange to say, when the difficulties have been removed, when the leaders of the different parties in all the different colonies have united upon common ground, and the time has come for us to obtain that which we have so long desired, there are found those among us who are unwilling to accept it!

That there would be doubts and hesitations at first is what might be expected; but we did not think there would be a movement made to reject the whole scheme. The difficulty in such cases has always been with the minor states, and the hon. member for South Colchester detailed to us the other day some of the perplexities which occurred in the different States of the American Union before the constitution was finally accepted. Especially was it unpalatable to those who thought their position and influence would be sacrificed. And is not this the feeling which prevails with us at present? Are not small local jealousies at the bottom of most of the objections? The colony which is most hostile now is the small Island of Prince Edward. The State which most stoutly refused to accept the constitution then was little Rhode Island. But has Rhode Island ever had reason to regret her ultimate acceptance? No, she has had her rights preserved intact in the two branches of congress and has prospered together with her Sister States, and far more than she could have done, had she determinedly held out for isolation.

But what are the advantages which we expect to derive from Union? I will give a short summary of them as they lie in my mind. They have been so often brought before the public, both in the press and on the platform, and recently by speakers in this house, that I feel I shall but go over ground which has been already fully occupied. And yet at the risk of wearying the patience of the house I will again refer to a few of them.

Union we truly believe is strength. We believe in the old maxim as a truism. "We have not forgotten the old fable of our boyhood, and yet in these latter days the old adage has been called in question, and isolation is lauded as practically of more value. It seems to me to require no argument to prove that whatever power or force there may be in isolated fragments is greatly extended when those fragments are consolidated into one. And that power when exerted in self-defence is far more effectual under the direction of one central authority, than when exerted by different and often conflicting influences. And this brings me to the next point. Union is defence.

A few years ago this question would not probably have been of so much importance as it is now, indeed it would hardly have been thought of. At the time of the visit of the Prince of Wales, and when he passed so tri-

umphantly through these Provinces, and the United States, what was the position of the neighboring Republic? It was one busy hive of industry; and the great object of its citizens was to labor to increase their wealth. Its military power was trifling. What is its position now? It has become one of the greatest military nations in the world, and that too upon our frontier. While we remain mere isolated settlements, this great nation is in a position to successfully attack us. If we can do anything, then, to protect ourselves, surely we ought to lose no time in doing so. If Union is one of the best means towards warding off an adversary, as we maintain it is, then let us adopt it. Now, I am far from being an alarmist. I believe the American Government has had the most friendly feelings towards these Colonies. The late President, to whose untimely end we referred recently with such deep sympathy, was, I am convinced, sincerely desirous of preserving peace between England and America, and the Governments of the different Provinces have always had the most amicable relations with that of the United States during all the perplexities of the terrible civil war now existing. But I am not insensible to the fact that democratic governments are frequently obliged to give up their own convictions and bow to the will of the people; and therefore I look with deep interest to the sentiments expressed by the journals and leading minds among our neighbors, and I cannot disguise from myself that there has been far from a friendly feeling manifested towards England in quarters where it was least expected. I do not refer so much to the *New York Herald*, and papers of that stamp, as to the expressed opinions of men of standing and intelligence. The other day I lighted upon a letter of Professor Parson, Professor of Law at the Harvard University, published a month or two since, that surprised me not a little, and serves to show the views entertained by some men, at least, in high position, in New England. From it I cull the following extract. He says:

"I have not the slightest hesitation in expressing my opinion that the conduct of England, relative to the Trent, was insolence carried to the last extreme; was a great insult to this country as well as a great wrong; and stained the name of England, in history, with disgrace. The thought is now in men's minds, that when our turn comes, we will imitate her example. That we will, so far as the different circumstances permit, use her own words and her own methods, and with an equal peremptoriness and a similar threat of immediate war and a refusal of delay or negotiation, force her into immediate choice between compliance or war. And if we would follow her example, we must do just this; neither more or less. Most earnestly do I deprecate any such thought, any such act.—But in my opinion the only way in which it can be prevented is to press upon our people the truth. For the lover of peace to forget the conduct of England or to defend it, is equally impossible. But our people may see that her conduct was not only so wrongful, but so discreditable, that they may determine to avoid what they would be ashamed to imitate."

I have found this letter in "Littell's Living Age," of February last, but I was glad to perceive that the editor of that periodical did not concur in all its views, and I hope that there may be a large number of the population agreeing with him, and that the danger anticipated may never come. Still, with the publication and circulation of such views, it is but right that we should remember that they bear upon the question of defence in these colonies. We know the old adage, that in peace