

he must act according to the circumstances in which he finds the existing Government. It is less by terror than by love and confidence, says Montesquieu, that men are governed, and it is absolute perfection in matter of Government is a myth, it is a fact that the best is the Government which adapts itself most closely to the climate, to the character, the usages, the habits, the prejudices even of the country."

The indisputable evidence of past history has long demonstrated the truth of those old but wise aphorisms. An hon. member—I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has quoted the example of Rome, but, if we go back to ancient history, what do we see? We see two great powers—according to the books of the colleges, which I suppose every one of you has read and translated—two great nations warring one against the other for the supremacy of the world—Carthage and Rome. If we look at the policy of those two great cities which founded two great nations, we find that the ruin of Carthage was brought about in great measure by the hostility which it developed to the nations it had subdued by its armies. In Sicily, where important Greek settlements had fallen into its power, a regular persecution was organised against the language, the customs, the opinions of the conquered. It succeeded in making of them irreconcilable enemies who rose against it at the hour of danger. Rome, on the contrary, courted the sympathies of the Greeks whom she had conquered. She encouraged the study of their language; she preserved their laws, respected their customs, their religion, their schools. The result of the two policies is written in history. Carthage was destroyed, when everything seemed to promise her success and domination. Rome gave to her citizens the freedom of the world and to her name an everlasting glory. What Carthage did, the Normans attempted in England after the conquest. There again the persecution saw the victims victorious in the long struggle, and England was founded, to continue the traditions, the success and the glory of the Roman Empire. If the proud and magic "Civis Sum Romanus" has had a rival in the talismanic "I am a British subject," it is due, in a great measure, to the liberal and generous policy of England, more than to the fear of her military power. The founder of the German Empire, Frederick the Great, understood the advantages which the conservative principles of the Catholic religion could give him in the Catholic provinces which he had subdued. He protected his new subjects in spite of the narrow-minded advisers who predicted that the court of Vienna would be served, in its intrigues, by the protection given to the Catholics of Silesia. The great emperor took no heed of those short-sighted counsels. In one of his letters I read these memorable words: "Emperor Joseph continues his work of secularisation without interruption. Here everybody remains as he was. I respect the rights of possession, upon which society is founded." And his Catholic provinces of Silesia remained faithful to him. Examples of the same kind are to be found in the history of all the great nations of Europe, where union began under the warm and beneficial influence of generosity and forbearance, leaving to the action of time the work of blending together nationalities and languages in the direction of perfect homogeneity. The great masters

in political science, the founders of vast and permanent empires, were above the prejudice of class, creed or race. Their wisdom enacted the great *Jus Gentium*, which is so, as Montesquieu observes, that "victory leaves to the conquered nations, besides life, those great things, liberty, laws, property, and religion always, when one is not blind, voluntarily." I might quote again, if I had not fear to weary the patience of the House, the authority that I quoted a moment ago, to confirm my assertion, that Great Britain acted wisely in granting those liberties and privileges to Canada, and that Canadians merited such a liberal treatment at the hands of the mother country. Lord Pufferin, in his reception at Windsor, Ontario, on the 19th August, 1874, spoke as follows:—

"But it is not merely on this ground that we are under obligation to the French Canadian race. It must not be forgotten that it is to its loftiness of spirit, to its love of liberty, and to its just appreciation of the civil rights contained in germ in the constitution originally granted by England to Canada, that we owe the development of this parliamentary autonomy of which the nation is justly proud; and I can assure you that, in the eyes of an Englishman, there are few things more degrading to observe than the dignity, the moderation, and the personal capability, with which the French statesmen of Canada and their English colleagues in applying and putting into active operation these grand principles of law and of constitutional practice, which are the foundation of the free government of this country."

After such high tributes given to our nation, I was surprised, Mr. Speaker, and I was shocked when I heard the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) using the following language:

"As to the loyalty of the Canadian bishops in refusing the offer of the Americans to join in the insurrection against England, I have my doubts about it; I am disposed to believe that they then obeyed the dictates of their own interests, to the interests of their church, more than to the true impulse of patriotism and loyalty."

The member for Norfolk will allow me to tell him he must have read in very strange books the history of our country, or he must have drunk at poisoned sources his inspirations, with regard to the great factors of our nationality, to have been guilty of such a cruel anachronism. Why, Mr. Speaker, leaving the largest possible margin for the shortcomings, nay, the faults of a part of our clergy—and I am ready to admit that such a margin can be made use of—I affirm, without fear of contradiction, that no more admirable and uninterrupted succession and tradition of loyalty and devotion to the British Crown can be traced than to the history of the Roman Catholic Episcopacy of Lower Canada. I say, hoping that my words are not unparliamentary, that no more undeserved, no more unwarranted slander was ever written than the page of our *Hanover* where those unfortunate utterances of the hon. member for Norfolk are recorded. Disloyal and selfish, the bishops of Quebec! Who retorted and repudiated the tempting offers, not of the Americans alone, but of the French generals whom the Catholic King of France had sent to assist the thirteen colonies in their rebellion against England? Was he disloyal, Mr. Speaker, the eminent Metropolitan of Quebec, who ordered a Thanksgiving to be observed, a solemn *Te Deum* to be sung in honor of the victory of Trafalgar, won by Nelson over the French forces, and who, in his pastoral letter, speaking of the reverse of the French arms, said this:

"What calamities would have happened to us if they (the Frenchmen) had seized His Majesty's possessions

a road, and so did their spirit. Was he to teach the crown, who prescribes the text the *prossit* that stru

"Does i emy" a e nation who I race, of that has g all virtues a verime affections

Who, aft of England

"What deep feeli sincere de conviction in their co with that

Are these man in h these loya priest, M prelate of most eloq the most whofough en, and friendship who recei judgment both to l Empire, the hon. surrection result of in what history o surrection Upper C prominent took part that the battle w which th century

Charla—ministra of the ex of abuses and tyra member friends—became entered through three res House, been rap that the language expendi guage in Second, and div