

not be supposed, that Great Britain would even have accepted the cession of the territory as a gift, if coupled with the condition of rearing Lower Canada to maturity as a French Empire. If such a condition would never have been tolerated, can it be right to act as if it had been agreed to? What has France done for Great Britain, that the latter should, at great expense of blood and treasure, rear up a French nation in North America? If that be the object, why is not the country immediately given up to France, that Great Britain may neither be burthened with present expenses nor exposed to the future wars in which the maintenance of Lower Canada as a French Colony would involve her. If to rear up a French nation in North America be not the object, must it not then be grievous injustice nay even cruelty towards coming generations, to extend the limits and increase the strength of a separation producing enmity and leading to collision and bloodshed between the different subjects and colonies of the same Parent Country?

It seems, on the whole, clear, that neither the honor nor the advantage of Great Britain nor of her colonies nor even the interests of humanity in these new countries can be consistent or compatible with the extension of the foreign and antiquated French laws and tenures now abolished in France itself or with the establishment of a French nation at British cost in North America.