

and actions corresponded with the savages of the present age? The French Canadians had been conquered, and they submitted, as good and faithful subjects, to the conquerors. They had proved their attachment to Great Britain at all times, and upon all occasions; they were seen in our fleets and armies during the late war, and in the still more destructive employment of transportation, suffering cold, hunger, and fatigue, hundreds of them had perished. Were not their achievements and their loyalty acknowledged and enrolled in the archives of the British government? Was it right, was it just, was it honourable, to make use of language so insulting to, and unmerited by, the Lower Canadians? No, such foul charges spring from a base and degenerate spirit, and deserved the reprobation of every individual. In his opinion, the great and only crime, that these brave men had been guilty of in the eyes of their enemies, was, their fond attachment to their king, and their determination to uphold the blessings of the British constitution, in despite of the menaces and allurements of faction."

"It appeared to him that the whole of this ill-timed measure took its rise from those few subjects from Great Britain, settled in Lower Canada, who, having engrossed the trade of both countries, had grown rich, ambitious, and saucy, and felt annoyed by the French laws and usages; and would be satisfied with nothing short of ruining the Upper-Canadians, by making tools of them to crush those people, who were as much entitled to their rights as we were to ours. The British population had no right to complain of French laws and French usages, they knew they were in existence when they arrived in the country, and, after approving of them by a residence of thirty years, they had no right to murmur.

Mr. Wilson then argued that the House of Assembly, not having the power to alter the constitution, had no right to intermeddle in the question, and quoted Ward on the law of nations, Grotius, and Vattel, in support of the several opinions he maintained.

"Precedents were not wanting to prove the evil of such an union. If they turned their eyes to Ireland for a moment, they might discover the effects it had on that country; the people grievously oppressed, the country abandoned by the gentry, and the money wrung from the sweat of poverty carried to foreign countries, and lavished in dissipation. The people of that beautiful but unhappy portion of Europe, were, by the union, reduced to famine, by famine they were driven to desperation, and by desperation they were driven to acts of violence, robbery and murder, which shocked the feelings of humanity. The inhabitants of Ireland were now bewailing her deplorable situation, and to add to her misfortunes, she is also torn by religious dissension. And who could assure him that