

rendered the measure highly useful at the same time that they increased the obstacles.

Thus, it is clear that the antipathies between the two races produced many obstacles to the English project, and, in order to remove these obstacles, England had recourse to means precisely similar to those adopted here as a preparation for Confederation, namely, the appointment of a conference of commissioners charged with the preparation of the Act of Union. Says M. EMILE DE BONNECHOSE :

These commissioners agreed on the general question, but differences arose as regards the manner in which the English proposed to constitute the new Parliament of the United Kingdom, and while the population of Scotland amounted to a sixth of the population of England, they allowed that kingdom but forty-six members in the Commons, or a thirtieth of the total representation. Sixteen peers only, out of the whole peerage of Scotland, were to be chosen by election, to sit in the English House of Lords. The stringency of these latter clauses, by which the people of Scotland felt themselves aggrieved, excited universal discontent; it was to be expected, particularly at the outset, from a treaty of union between the two nations, that there would be a clashing of material interests prejudicial to the welfare of very many persons, as occurs at the outset in every important political connection. The wounding of their national self-love would of itself have been sufficient to render the people of Scotland insensible to the remote advantages of the compact, and all parties—Whigs and Tories, Jacobites and Williamites, Presbyterians, Episcopalians and Cameronians, combined to defeat it.

Thus we have nearly the whole people uniting to oppose the union it was sought to impose upon them, and yet in face of the all but unanimous opposition of the people of Scotland, England succeeded in forcing them into the union by the use of means she never hesitates to adopt :—

The commissioners of the Government were insulted by the populace, who destroyed the dwellings of many state officials favorable to the union, while they were loud in praise of the Duke of HAMILTON, one of the chief opponents of the measure. The Dukes of QUEENSBERRY and ARGYLE, Earls of MONTROSE, STAIR, ROXBURGH and MARCHMONT strove in vain to allay by argument and reasoning, the explosion of patriotic feeling and national fury, and what the best arguments could not obtain was carried by corruption. A portion of the gold promised by the English Commissioners as a compensation for the fresh burdens about to be imposed upon the sister kingdom, was divided amongst their Scotch colleagues and many influential members of the Parliament sitting in Edinburgh; thenceforward

all obstacles were removed; the treaty of union, which the Scotch people looked upon as an act of suicide, and which the purest and best men would not have sanctioned, received the assent of a venal majority. In fine, that famous compact, which was denounced as a dishonor to Scotland, which that country looked upon as the yielding up of her interests and her glory, and which was destined to open for her, in subsequent times, an era of unparalleled peace and prosperity, was signed on the 1st May, 1707, and was considered a great triumph by the people of England, already at that time intoxicated with joy at the success of their arms on the continent. ●

There, Mr. SPEAKER, is an instance of the manner in which the policy of England can overcome even the most justifiable resistance, supported by the unanimous wishes of a people. Scotland looked upon a union with England as an act of suicide, and yet the union was carried by a majority in the Parliament of Edinburgh. I need not dwell at length upon these facts; they speak eloquently for themselves. (Hear, hear.) There is another fact in the parliamentary history of England, of which it is well to remind the House—I mean the abolition of the Irish Parliament. The Honorable Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. McGEE) has told us, in that flowery language which characterises the children of his native soil, that he himself, when scarce twenty years of age, struggled to emancipate his country from the tyranny of England, and not succeeding in his noble undertaking, preferred to exile himself to American soil rather than remain to be a daily spectator of the misfortunes and sufferings of his native land. And yet, what is he now doing? He is trying, with the help of a hostile majority, to thrust upon Lower Canada, his adopted country, a union which is repugnant to her, and to revive here the system of oppression over which he wept in Ireland. (Hear, hear.) Let us see what the means were which were employed to impose upon Ireland that union which was destined to entail the wholesale exodus of her population :—

In the case of Ireland, the contest was a longer one, but England was ultimately triumphant. After the crisis of 1798, (says M. GUSTAVE DE BEAUMONT,) England, holding down rebellious and vanquished Ireland, chastised her unrelentingly and pitilessly. Twenty years previously Ireland again came into possession of her political liberties; England preserved a bitter recollection of this success of Ireland, and took advantage of the depression of the latter to replace her under an absolute yoke. The Irish Parliament, after recovering its independence, became troublesome