

consistent with the history of maritime States. It is true, there is an obvious reform, in the conduct of the people and governments of particular countries; but still the selfish principle rules in cabinets as well as in counting-houses. If any such jealousy or enmity shall arise, we may defy it, if Heaven shall endow us with wisdom, to preserve our Union; but "this (says Washington) is the point in our political fortress, against which the batteries of *internal* and *external* enemies, will be most constantly, though covertly directed."

Such reflections, as these, made me deplore our conduct to Mexico. It has given a plausible excuse to foreigners, to desire to check our growth. It is not the interest of mankind, that we should become the Russia of the New World. Europe has a deep stake in the trade of South America, Mexico and the West Indies. Having seen some of our Senators pointing to the Pacific, as our destined boundary; and contemplating Mexico as our next scene of insurrectionary operation; European statesmen may consider themselves authorised to stop us in our march. How that may be done may become the only question; and the project of Sir Alexander Malet may not be deemed visionary.

The same considerations, which made me deprecate our conduct to Mexico, influence my wishes as to Canada. I desire that we may give no cause of offence, or pretext for retaliation hereafter. But, at the same time, if we interfered at all, it should not have been against a weak and unoffending neighbour, from whom we had nothing to apprehend hereafter; but, in favor of oppressed neighbours, against a power holding them as a rod over us.

I am not, however, let me repeat, for any interference, that is not right in itself, or warranted by what is called the law of nations. I am not for approving, as to Canada, what I condemned in relation to Mexico. As a government, we have quite enough to do at home. Time, the press and steam are at work for Canada, for ourselves and for mankind. The liberty of Canada may be won in Europe or in Asia. It must be ultimately achieved. Even Machiavel admits, "It is hopeless to reduce to slavery a people imbued with the spirit of freedom." In the meantime, our own best shields are honesty and fair dealing with all around us, be they weak or strong. We need a reputation, especially for being content with what we have. We want condensation and homogeneity, not expansion and diversity.

If there is any discrepancy, between what I wrote as to Texas, and what I have thus said, I am not aware of it. I reprobated the armed invasion of the territory of a neighbour, not in revolt. I condemned the conspiracy, among our own citizens, to go and take whole provinces from a weak and unoffending people, who were under no foreign yoke. I appealed to the sense of justice of our country, against the open connivance of our government, at what history must pronounce dishonorable. All this I did as to Texas, and would do so, were the case of Canada parallel. But the cases are wholly dissimilar; and yet, I am not for interference by our government; and, since it is the requisition of the law, I am not for the interference of our citizens.

But, while these are my sentiments, I still wish to see the Canadians free, and I am not surprised at the efforts of some of our citizens to make them so. There may be reckless men on our frontier, as there