

but by means of that mixed form of government which is embodied in the British Constitution.*

Thirdly,—That as the connexion to be enduring must be mutually beneficial, so the administration of the government must be in general agreement with the interests of the people.

These assumptions will meet with a prompt response from every British heart. If any man would question them, we shall not. If any man would travel abroad in search of other models, we shall not accompany him for that purpose, although we may derive instruction both from these models, and from the Utopian schemes that would amalgamate them all, or set up another Goddess of Reason for the world to admire. On the ground which we have laid down, and which will be in our political articles what axioms are in geometry, or first principles in morals, we proceed to make such observations as present affairs seem to require.

And first, assuming that Canada is to remain connected with the British Empire, then, in this, as in all other connexions, there must be a mutual relinquishment of such minor points as are found to be incompatible with the harmony and prosperity of the connexion. The Indian, standing alone in the forest, may consult nothing but his own will, and may effect its purposes so far as he has the means of doing so; but the moment that he forms a union with another, for any purpose whatever, that moment there must be a yielding by each of his own will, so far as it would interfere with the attainment of that common object. Were each individual of a political party to insist stubbornly on his own will, the ruin of the party must inevitably ensue. For on every question that might arise, no two individuals of the party would be found to agree entirely on the whole question. The general agreement on its leading points would be greatly checkered by diversity of opinion on its details, and it would be only by mutual yielding on these matters that united action on the whole case could be attained. What is necessary in individuals or in parties is still more necessary in States; for in them the different interests are infinitely more numerous, various, complicated, and important; and the result, for good or ill, is of

infinitely greater magnitude, both in its direct effect, and its remote consequences. History is full of examples in which this mutual yielding, either of parties in a State, or of separate States in a common league, has produced the happiest effects. Passing by other instances, we shall adduce the compromise between the northern and southern States of the American Union on the Tariff question. The difference of opinion and interest on this point was so great, that a dissolution of the Union was threatened, and North Carolina prepared for a resort to arms, in order to defend what she conceived to be her rights. In this alarming aspect of things, the leaders of the respective parties were induced to agree to a compromise, by which each yielded somewhat of their several claims; and thus the danger was averted, and the Union was preserved inviolate. And it must be observed that this compromise was on a subject respecting which the Americans are said to be very sensitive. It was purely a question of *interest*—of dollars and cents,—a question which admitted of no difference of opinion as to its nature. It was, shall the northern manufacturer be protected at the expense of the southern planter? or, shall the latter have nearly a free market at the expense of the former? And if on a question of this nature there was such a mutual yielding, how much more is it necessary on political questions, which only remotely affect any man's interest, and which produce great difference of opinion as to their nature and effects, and therefore should make every man cautious in stubbornly insisting on his own will? We have adduced this example from a republic, in order to shew that under the most liberal form of government, to yield extreme opinions for the sake of a common benefit, is a sacred duty which every patriot owes to his country. If other examples are required, we need only refer to the conduct of the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel on the question of Catholic Emancipation.

Notwithstanding the obvious necessity of this mutual yielding, there are persons who do not, or will not, perceive it; or rather, they suppose that the yielding must be all on the other side, none on their own. They are quite willing that their opponents shall yield to them, but they will yield nothing in return. Such a one-sided application of the duty is tantamount to a denial of it altogether; and such persons

* The military power of the State is to defend the Colonies, not to rule them. They must be ruled by the Constitution.