

our own waters, may be passed over—may we not look into the future?—With what view has Canada been held? Have any advantages warranted the enormous expenditures there? With what view did the Governor of Canada, Sir J. Craig, send John Henry to Boston? Can there be a doubt, but that Canada has been held, in the expectation of making it a wedge to sever our Union? I have understood, that, under lord Castlereagh, the use to which Canada might be put, was solemnly discussed; and that, under lord Wellington, a line of fortifications for future purposes, was traced out, and partly constructed. In a late debate, on the Canada question, in the British house of Peers, the latter said, that the next war with us must not be “a little war.”

In a pamphlet, entitled “Canada a Kingdom,” written by Sir Alexander Malet, dedicated to lord Howick, and published in 1832, there is the following remarkable passage:

“The aristocracy of wealth, which the unexampled progress, of national prosperity, has elevated upon the surface of republican institutions [in the United States,] has not been, and should not be, overlooked by English statesmen. Let them raise a sceptre on the banks of the St. Lawrence, and we may live to see its shadow on the Delaware and Potomac.”

The coincidence, between the views of Sir J. Craig, and those of Sir A. Malet, after a lapse of more than twenty years, shows that British statesmen do not overlook the advantages, which their country may derive from our dismemberment. No one can doubt their inclination to witness it; and there may still be among ourselves some, who would desire to make “the Potomac the boundary.” The British possessions in America, therefore, may be held until some occasion may arise, fit for making the surrender of them a temptation, to raise some such sceptre as is here referred to.

You may regard such fears as chimerical. I hope they are so. No one abhors wars more than I do; nor is there any one, who would regret hostilities with England especially, more than I would. But, unhappily, apprehension is the result of experience. In a debate on the Canada question, in the British House of Peers, Lord Brougham said, he hoped our Union might long endure; for, if broken up, the most disastrous consequences would follow, owing to the natural inclination of man for war. It is painful, and even degrading, to think so; and yet it may be hazardous to entertain an opposite opinion. Be this as it may, certain it is, that history is little more than a record of such atrocities, as even the callous must shudder at. Nations, falsely calling themselves Christians, have out-run all barbarians in the race of blood. I fear, it is, therefore, fallacious to hope, that, even if we shall give no cause of alarm, we shall escape the fate of other States; and, consequently, it is hazardous to neglect suitable means of defence, or to stifle a spirit, which is essential for the preservation of all that is dear to man—

*Gens ferri patiens, ac læta domare labores,
Paulatim antiquo Patrum desuescit honori.*

Our rapid advancement to power, as a republic, is well calculated to disturb crowned heads; and our commercial and naval propensities can scarcely be contemplated with satisfaction, by England especially. There is a lurking apprehension, of our future power, which is perfectly