

selves in the best manner we could. The latter he was far from thinking an impossible event; it had been spoken of more than once, and no reasonable man could look to it without dread; * for in such case we must either yield to Lower Canada, or (what by some would be considered far less exceptionable,) *unite ourselves with our neighbours on the other side o. the lake.*"

In another part of Mr. Hagerman's speech in reply to what had been said in denial of the anti-commercial spirit of the people of Lower Canada, "he would only ask to look at the speeches of the persons in Lower Canada, opposed to the union, who emphatically styled themselves *the lords of the soil*, and see with what contempt they spoke of the merchants of the country, to whom it owed all its wealth and prosperity; no, those gentlemen would be glad to maintain their feudal system, so repugnant to commercial spirit."

I have quoted this passage in order to expose the numerous fallacies that are comprehended in a few short sentences. I am not aware that the expression "lords of the soil" has occurred in the speeches of any of the constitutionalists, but, if it had, it would in one sense have been correct. Who are, or ought to be the lords of the soil, save the descendants of the original planters, or those who derive titles from them? but they do not want to encroach upon the rights of others, they do not want to extend their domains beyond the prescribed bounds, they seek not to add the ungranted lands to their possessions, they do not, like the Scotch intruders, who want to push them from their stools, desire to grasp at granted and ungranted lands, and turn the original proprietors into helots and slaves, to work for a distant lord, spending his wealth, got by the yard

of greater equity, as well as foresight, than that they should adopt a measure fraught with such direful consequences. But, if they entertain the thought, I say again: LET THEM LOOK TO IT. And this leads me to another note:

* *Although it would be with awe and dread, I should look to a contest with the metropolitan state, a contingency most devoutly to be deprecated, and sincerely deplored, it would not be with any despondency, either as to the means possessed by Canada of resistance, or as to the ultimate result, whatever the miseries, the havock, the privations that would be suffered in the interim. But, as to the case put by Mr. H. that of Great Britain merely withdrawing her support from us, and leaving us to govern and support ourselves in the best manner we could; so far from considering that to be a situation for a reasonable man to dread, were we but in the middle of the nineteenth century, instead of being only just passed its commencement, I should consider it as "a consummation devoutly to be wished"*