

have drawn these separated colonies, with irresistible force, towards New York and Washington. A Zollverein or customs union might have been the next step towards the identification of interests, which ultimately must have led to an identification of institutions. And, condemn as we may, the Montreal Annexation Movement of 1849, it is certain that there was a good deal to be said *then* in its favor, which only time could have answered—and which time, it may be added, has pretty conclusively answered *since*. But now it would be a grave mistake to forget that the annexation question may be forced on us in another shape by the other party—the adjacent Northern and Western States. The new political necessities of their position, the ever-increasing bulk of their commerce, must lead them to desire a closer union of interests with Canada. Our future is not, we may rest assured, a thing unthought of among their shrewd speculators. At Chicago it has long occupied that large share of public attention which is too often denied to it at Quebec. And if urged from that quarter—as they may hereafter urge it—it will not be in a hostile but in a business-like spirit; they will endeavour to find partisans for their projects among every class of our own people; they can appeal powerfully to some of our strongest special interests, and to some of our most urgent public requirements; they will have a potent word to say to farmers and forwarders, the shareholders in ill paying lines, and projectors of new routes of traffic; on the Georgian Bay and the Upper Ottawa, on the Welland and at Montreal, it would be unwise to conclude that the arguments for annexation, founded on material considerations, have been exhausted. To combat these arguments by others, drawn from the cost, waste, and burthens of the civil war, will hardly be sufficient. The Americans may answer that enormous as their expenditure has been, it has only gone to show the immensity of their resources; that as they have proved their ability to keep 700,000 men under arms, to feed, pay, and throw them away, it is in vain for these smaller and poorer Provinces to resist their “manifest destiny.” This will be their line of reasoning; it is not, indeed, unanswerable; but if we descend to combat material inducements with material objections, we shall run the risk of not arousing a united, cordial, and high-spirited public resistance to such insidious propositions.

Are we prepared to join issue with the philo-Americans on broader and better grounds than those depending altogether on considerations of pecuniary advantage? If not, the discussion may be considered closed; if we are, then why not assume at once the better and broader grounds?

It cannot be denied by any Canadian that, since the era of responsible government, we have advanced constantly towards the American, and receded from the British standard of government. The power and patronage of the crown has been reduced to the lowest point; the Upper