

into a bloody war—as the aggressor—with all his neighbors. Alone, and simultaneously, he had on his hands Austria, France and Russia. Yet he left to his successor a kingdom of 74,000 square miles, and a people numbering nearly six millions. The small and heroic republic of Holland did not hesitate to enter into a war with the mighty monarchy of Spain, then mistress of the wealth of the Indies. At this day her vessels are found in every sea. Java and Sumatra belong to her. Yet her population is smaller than that of the Provinces of British North America. Single-handed in 1848, Piedmont dared to enter on a struggle with Austria. The King of Piedmont had then four millions of subjects; he now reigns over twenty-two millions. Even poor little Greece, with a million of inhabitants, must have its share in revolutions, choose a king, and talk of its rights, its pretensions, and its aspirations. No, Mr. SPEAKER, the one, the only means of safety for us, in the circumstances, is to have a Federal union of all our provinces—a social, political, commercial and military union. Happen what may, when we have done all that men of courage and energy can be expected to do to mend our position, our future will not be so dark as the friends and advocates of the *status quo* would have us believe. Do these wonderful patriots really believe in their hearts, that continuing to be isolated as they are from each other, having no cordial alliance, almost no relations or intercourse, the Provinces of British North America would be either stronger or less exposed to the attacks of the Northern States than they would be if united? Are those persons not original in their ideas who allege that the endeavor of the Provinces of British North America to form a Confederation is a kind of provocation and defiance to the Northern States? If the Northern States made this allegation, the most that could be said of it would be, that it would be a vain pretext, as futile as it would be absurd. Not less ridiculous and misjudging are those persons who pretend that the Confederation of the Provinces of British North America would be a step towards annexation to the Northern States. Truly, there are some minds which have an odd way of looking at things. If, indeed, the opponents of Confederation would only prescribe some other remedy to obviate the evils which threaten us as an effect of Confederation, we should have at least the benefit of a choice; but no—nothing of the sort—they attack, criticise, but suggest

nothing. On the other hand, the principal journals of Europe and several respectable journals in the neighboring States have recorded their approbation of the scheme of Confederation submitted by the Government, and predict a brilliant future for the new empire which is about to arise on this side of the frontier line. (Hear, hear.) Referring to history, we find that confederations have been formed in nearly all ages, and that the principal cause of their formation has been, not only the purpose of mutual protection, but a military object. These two motives combined with a third, that of commercial advantages, suggested the project which now occupies our attention. Among the ancient Greeks there were several Federal unions, the two principal being the *Ætolian* and the *Achæan*; the former, dating from a period long antecedent to that of *ALEXANDER*, was broken up by the subjection of the states composing the league to Rome, about 180 years B. C.; the second, which was formed about 280 years B. C., was destroyed by the Romans about 150 years before the vulgar era. The *Ætolian* Confederation comprised all the northern parts of Greece on the confines of Thessaly and Epirus, a portion of Central Greece, and several of the islands of the *Ægean* sea. This was a union rather of provinces than of cities. It had a "Constitution," "States General," a chief magistrate, a commander-in-chief, and different public officers, with different functions or powers; the power of declaring war and that of making peace, of levying taxes, coining money current at that time—all were intrusted to the Central Government. The *Achæan* League, on the contrary, was a union, not of provinces, but of cities or towns—not less than seventy in number. There was a Federal capital, a "Constitution," different public officers, each invested with privileges and certain powers and duties, too many to be enumerated in this place. Who has not read the life of *ARATUS* and that of *PHILOPŒMEN*, the latter one of the greatest statesmen, the other the greatest captain of the *Achæan* union? In reading the history of these nations we shall find that it was their union which saved them so long from the inroads of their enemies, and which, for ages, preserved their autonomy. We next come to the Italian Confederation of the middle ages. Like those of Greece, they derived their origin from military necessity. The League of Lombardy, and that of the Tuscans, were projected principally as a mutual protection