

19/
CANADA.

DESPATCH

FROM THE

GOVERNOR-GENERAL OF CANADA,

FORWARDING AN

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

FROM THE

DOMINION HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TOGETHER WITH THE

SECRETARY OF STATE'S REPLY THERETO.

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.
July 1890.



LONDON:
PRINTED FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY EYRE AND SPOTTISWOODE,
PRINTERS TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

And to be purchased, either directly or through any Bookseller, from
EYRE and SPOTTISWOODE, East Harding Street, Fleet Street, E.C., and
32, ABINGDON STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.; or
ADAM and CHARLES BLACK, 6, NORTH BRIDGE, EDINBURGH; or
HODGES, FIGGIS, & Co., 104, GRAFTON STREET, DUBLIN.

1890.

[C.—6114.] *Price 2d.*

CONTENTS.

Serial N ^o .	From or to whom.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
1	Lord Stanley of Preston	1890. June 9 (Rec. June 23).	Forwards, with remarks, copy of a loyal address to the Queen, unanimously voted by the House of Commons of the Dominion in January, together with a report of the debate thereon.	3
2	To Lord Stanley of Preston	July 9	Conveys the expression of Her Majesty's pleasure at receiving this renewed proof of the loyalty and devotion of the Canadian House of Commons and of her subjects generally in the Dominion.	15

No. 1.

LORD STANLEY OF PRESTON to LORD KNUTSFORD.

(Received June 23, 1890.)

MY LORD,

Citadel, Quebec, June 9, 1890.

I HAVE the honour to transmit by this mail a copy of a loyal address unanimously voted in the House of Commons of the Dominion Parliament in the month of January last, which I have just received from the Speaker of the House, with the request that it may be laid at the foot of the Throne in the manner which you may deem proper.

2. I also enclose a copy of the House of Commons Reports of the 29th of January containing an account of the debate.

3. The address was moved by Mr. Mulock, Member of Parliament for North York, Ontario, a Liberal in politics, and therefore at the present time a member of the Opposition. When first placed on the notice paper the resolution was by some persons thought to be unnecessary, but after the explanation of the mover an interesting debate ensued during which members of both parties vied in expressing their loyalty to the Crown.

4. Mr. Mulock in submitting the motion stated that whatever party differences there might be he believed that there was one common bond of union—the great principle of British connexion. He did not move the address on account of any circumstances which had occurred, or which were occurring then, within the borders of Canada, but for the purpose of removing misapprehensions and of contradicting statements which if allowed to remain longer unchallenged were calculated to be injurious to the best interests of the Dominion.

5. He went on to say that it had been asserted in the press of the United States, and especially so during the past few months, that political institutions in Canada were being broken up, that the people were divided, race against race, creed against creed, province against province, and the Dominion against the Empire, and that this (it was alleged) had created a feeling in favour of independence or of annexation to the States which was only awaiting the opportunity to take practical form and shape. He added that the United States Congress had appointed a committee of the Senate ostensibly to inquire into the relations of Canada with the United States, but that the principal anxiety of the Commission was apparently to discover satisfactory evidence that Canada was in a frame of mind to be annexed to the United States. He believed that Canada was full of people who rejoiced by reason of their connexion with the British Empire, and that nothing had more aided it than “the events of the Victorian era in which we now live.” He moved the resolution believing that it was expedient that a candid declaration should be made in public of what were the sentiments of the people.

6. Mr. Mulock was seconded by Mr. Amyot, who commenced by saying that he spoke as a British subject of French descent. He quoted numerous extracts to show that the loyalty of the French Canadians had been often and fully recognised. He went on to say that they enjoyed a constitution which they admired, and that they are proud of being British subjects because under that constitution they find freedom, justice, and peace. In conclusion, he repeated the words of the celebrated Sir Etienne Taché “that the last gun which would be fired in defence of the British flag on this continent might very well be fired by a French Canadian.”

7. Sir John MacDonal, Prime Minister, and the Honourable Mr. Laurier (a French Canadian and formerly a member of Mr. Mackenzie's Government) now leader of the Opposition, in following the mover and seconder stated that though they had perhaps thought in the first instance that the resolution was unnecessary, they were now of opinion after hearing what had been said that it thoroughly expressed the sentiments of the representatives of the people of the Dominion. Their speeches were followed by those of some other members, and the house finally—according to the custom here—divided, the yeas being 161 and the nays none.

8. A subsequent motion was made for an address to the Governor-General praying that the address which had been the subject of the motion should be laid at the foot of the Throne.

9. In pursuance of which I have the honour to address these remarks to your Lordship.

I have, &c.

(Signed) STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Right Hon. Lord Knutsford, G.C.M.G.,
&c. &c. &c.

Enclosure 1 in No. 1.

TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN,

WE, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, desire most earnestly in our own name and on behalf of the people whom we represent, to renew the expression of our unswerving loyalty and devotion to Your Majesty's person and Government.

We have learned with feelings of entire disapproval that various public statements have been made calling in question the loyalty of the people of Canada to the political union now happily existing between this Dominion and the British Empire and representing it as the desire of the people of Canada to sever such connexion.

We desire therefore to assure Your Majesty that such statements are wholly incorrect representations of the sentiments and aspirations of the people of Canada, who are among Your Majesty's most loyal subjects, devotedly attached to the political union existing between Canada and the mother-country, and earnestly desire its continuance.

We feel assured that Your Majesty will not allow any such statements, emanating from any source whatever, to lessen Your Majesty's confidence in the loyalty of your Canadian subjects to Your Majesty's person and Government, and will accept our assurances of the contentment of Your Majesty's Canadian subjects with the political connexion between Canada and the rest of the British Empire, and of their fixed resolve to aid in maintaining the same.

We pray that the blessings of Your Majesty's reign may, for your people's sake, be long continued.

(Signed) J. ALD. OUMET,
Speaker.

House of Commons, Canada,
Wednesday, 29th January 1890.

Enclosure 2 in No. 1.

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES, JANUARY 29th, 1890.

Loyalty to Her Majesty.

Mr. Mulock: On Monday last when I was about to move the resolution which I now desire to move, the First Minister requested that the motion should be allowed to stand in order that he might have a conversation with me on the subject. The motion accordingly stood, and I had the advantage of a conversation with the First Minister. I may say that the whole tenor of the conversation was simply that I might make certain verbal changes in the resolution without in the slightest degree impairing the effect of it. I mention that particularly, because I have been told that very inaccurate reports have gone abroad as to the proposed object of the First Minister in speaking to me. The whole tenor of the right hon. gentleman's conversation with me was that he highly approved of the spirit of the motion, but thought it might be possible to improve the style of it. I entirely concurred with him, and, as a result of the conversation, the motion has been slightly varied and a reprint of the altered motion placed in the hands of hon. members. I may say further that I omitted to consult an important element in the House at the time, and therefore the draft of the corrected motion went to the printer without having been submitted to the representatives of the various parties in

the House. After it was printed the leader of the Third Party suggested to me that there should be a little further change, and that suggestion I thought reasonable. I mentioned it to the First Minister and he thought it reasonable, and consequently I presume that everyone will think it reasonable. Therefore, with the consent of the House, I will now read the motion proposed to be submitted, and ask the permission of the House that it be substituted for the one of which notice has been given, as follows:—

That an humble address be presented to the Queen's most Excellent Majesty in the following words:—

MOST GRACIOUS MAJESTY,

WE, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, desire most earnestly in our own name and on behalf of the people whom we represent to renew the expression of our unswerving loyalty and devotion to Your Majesty's person and Government.

We have learned with feelings of entire disapproval that various public statements have been made calling in question the loyalty of the people of Canada to the political union now happily existing between this Dominion and the British Empire and representing it as the desire of the people of Canada to sever such connexion.

We desire, therefore, to assure Your Majesty that such statements are wholly incorrect representations of the sentiments and aspirations of the people of Canada, who are among Your Majesty's most loyal subjects, devotedly attached to the political union existing between Canada and the mother-country, and earnestly desire its continuance.

We feel assured that Your Majesty will not allow any such statements, emanating from any source whatever, to lessen Your Majesty's confidence in the loyalty of your Canadian subjects to Your Majesty's person and Government, and will accept our assurances of the contentment of Your Majesty's Canadian subjects with the political connexion between Canada and the rest of the British Empire, and of their fixed resolve to aid in maintaining the same.

We pray that the blessings of Your Majesty's reign may, for your people's sake, be long continued.

Mr. Mulock: My object in submitting this motion is not for the information of the hon. members of this House, or for the information of the country. I think for anyone to suggest that such a course as this was necessary for such a purpose would be to offend the intelligence alike of the House and the country. We may have our party differences in regard to what we deem to be the best methods of promoting the public welfare, but we also have, as I trust and believe, a common bond of union—the great principle of British connexion; a principle which, I submit, controls all political thought in Canada; a principle before which all other questions dwarf almost into insignificance; a principle which is, and I trust will continue to be, the touchstone of political thought in Canada. That principle has developed for us a position here which we enjoy as citizens of the greatest empire known to civilisation, an empire which, I think, to-day commands in a greater degree than in any other period in the history of our country the admiration and the love of the whole people of this country, and which has, I believe, developed amongst us a common standing ground and common cause which makes the hearts of the whole people beat as one. I repeat, therefore, that I do not make this motion for our information or for the information of the country, believing it to be but a feeble echo of the sentiments which are entertained by the whole country; nor do I make it out of any individual or party considerations, nor because of any circumstance which has occurred, or which is occurring, within the borders of Canada; but I make it for the purpose of removing, if possible, misapprehensions, and contradicting statements that have been made and which perhaps have already been of great injury to Canada, and which, if allowed to remain any longer unchallenged, are calculated to be injurious to our best interests. I am sure that, in an assemblage such as this, it will be unnecessary for me to observe any particularity in regard to what I refer to. We are all observers of current events, we are all readers of the literature of the day, and we have had the opportunity of observing the trend of the American press during the last few months. In that press you find a doctrine set forth as if it were the expression of one mind, but appearing in the whole of the press of the United States and being in that way spread far and wide. You find it asserted there that the political institutions in Canada are broken down, that we are a people divided against ourselves or amongst ourselves, that we are torn apart by internal dissensions, that race is set against race, creed against creed, province against province, and the Dominion against the Empire; and that this has created a feeling in favour of independence or annexation which is now only awaiting the opportunity to take practical

form and shape. These statements have, no doubt, already done injury to our country. A surplus population does not seek countries which are supposed to be bordering on revolution. Capital does not seek investment in countries which are supposed not to be blessed with stable Government. Therefore, for the information of the outside world, for the information of those who have not had the advantage of being born or becoming Canadian citizens, for their advantage and for our own advantage ultimately, I have asked the House to adopt this resolution. To give further colour to these statements we find that the United States Congress appointed a Committee of the Senate ostensibly to inquire into the relations of Canada with the United States; but if anyone investigated the proceedings of that Committee he would find that apparently the principal anxiety of the Commission is to discover satisfactory evidence that this country is in a frame of mind to be annexed to the United States. I know of no better way of meeting their curiosity on that subject, and at the same time of settling this question, than for the people of Canada, through their representatives here assembled, to make an authoritative deliverance upon the subject. Such a deliverance will go far I believe, to settle the question in the minds of the people of the United States, and in the minds of the people of the old land, those of England and of continental Europe, and then I hope it will result in setting once more flowing towards our shores the surplus capital and the surplus population of those old lands which are so much wanted for the development of the resources of this vast Dominion. I make this statement in no feeling of unfriendliness to the United States. We cannot blame them for casting longing eyes towards this favoured land, but we can only attribute that to Canada's worth, and therefore to that extent we can appreciate their advances. But that the American people seriously believe that Canada, a land so full of promise, is now prepared, in her very infancy, to commit political suicide I cannot for a moment believe. Do the American people believe that this young country, with her admirable resources, with a population representing the finest races of human blood, with political institutions based upon a model that has stood the strain for ages, and has ever become stronger—do they believe that this country, possessing within her own limits all the essentials for enduring national greatness, is now prepared to abandon the work of the Confederation fathers, and pull out from the Confederation edifice the cement of British connexion which holds the various parts of the edifice together? Do they, I say, believe that the people of Canada are prepared in that way to disappear from the nations of the earth, amidst the universal contempt of the world? No, Mr. Speaker, the American people are too intelligent to believe any such a thing. They have been trying to make themselves believe it, but they cannot do it. But whether they believe it or not—no matter who believes it outside of Canada—I venture to say the Canadian people do not believe it; and whatever be the destiny of Canada, I trust that such as I have indicated is not to be her destiny—Canada, full of a people who rejoice, as I said before, more, perhaps, than they ever did yet, by reason of their connexion with an empire that has girdled the whole earth with a confederacy of provinces for the promotion of a higher civilisation, not for the sake of conquest. Sir, that connexion, I believe, has, if possible, intensified the feeling of love which is entertained by the people of Canada towards the union, and nothing, perhaps, has more aided it than the events of the Victorian era in which we now live. It is not my intention to refer to anything that can possibly suggest a controversy upon this question. In order that this motion may have the fullest effect it should have, I think, the heartiest endorsement, the unanimous endorsement of this House. I shall, therefore, avoid any further discussion of this question, believing, as I do, that there is nothing in respect to British political connexion that ought to interfere with the material prosperity of our country. Believing this, and believing that the present is an opportune time for us to make a candid declaration of what we deem to be the sentiments of the country, and believing also that such a declaration will not be an unwelcome communication to Her Majesty, I beg to move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Amyot : As a British subject of French descent, I have great pleasure in seconding the motion of my hon. friend. I endorse every one of his words, and I am happy to choose this occasion to speak in the name of the county which I have the honour to represent in this House. I think the motion is opportune, and I will take this occasion to tell the new members of this House who, perhaps, have not studied our history fully, the exact position that we have occupied in the past, so far as loyalty is concerned, and the reasons why we French Canadians are loyal to the Crown. After the Treaty of Paris a great many struggles occurred between the old and new colonists, as might have been expected, and as is always the case when a sudden change takes place in a country. After many petitions and representations, the Act of Quebec, in 1774, passed, and it was

accepted by our forefathers as a good step in the right direction. That Act was granted in spite of the opposition of some fanatics and of some speculators, and the very next year our forefathers had occasion to prove their gratitude to England and their loyalty to the new flag. The Americans invaded the country, and it was owing to the efforts, to the chivalry, to the valour of the French Canadian people, powerfully aided, of course, by the few English troops that were here, that Canada was retained as a possession of the Crown of England, in 1775. As my words alone may not be of sufficient authority, I will quote from Biggar, in his work, "Canada—a Memorial Volume," at page 27, where he says:—

"While there was, as a matter of course, a good deal of friction between the new subjects, as the French were called, and the British settlers or 'old subjects,' under the temperate and judicious guidance of General Murray and Sir Guy Carleton, matters proceeded hopefully and the country entered upon a career of prosperity, rapidly increasing in population and wealth."

At page 28 he says:—

"The colonists were now called upon to pass through another war period—bloody but brief—and this time with their own countrymen across the border. In the year following the passing of the Quebec Act, the long smouldering fires of secession in the American colonies burst into flame. On April 19th, 1775, the 'Minute men' of Concord Lexington 'fired the first shot heard around the world,' and the War of Independence began, which ended in the loss to England of her 'American' colonies. One of the first steps taken by the secessionists was to capture Ticonderoga and Crown Point on Lake Champlain, and thus possess the gateway to Canada. Forts St. John and Chambly soon followed, and on the 12th November Montreal succumbed; but the tide turned, when, flushed with their first success the Americans essayed the capture of Quebec, two daring attempts resulting in disastrous failure."

In 1808, although we did not possess then a full measure of liberty, though our old laws and customs were not entirely recognized, yet our forefathers were always loyal; and we find that Sir James Craig, the Governor, expressed himself as follows in opening Parliament:—

"He added, however, that means for meeting adverse eventualities were not to be neglected; and he had the firmest confidence that the co-operation of the people in that respect would not be wanting; while the loyalty and zeal of the militia met his own warmest approbation. All appearances gave promise that, if the colony were attacked, it would be defended in such a manner as was to be expected of a brave race, who fight for all that is dear to it. . . . The reply of the Assembly was of a character which ought to have persuaded Britons that they might reckon on the fidelity of the Canadians, despite the prejudices and fears which late repeated appeals to it betrayed."

In the years 1812, 1813 and 1814 a new war occurred between England and the United States. Again our forefathers had the opportunity to show their fidelity to the British Crown. Those who have read our history cannot but admire the struggles that took place then, and the extraordinary victories won by a few hundred men over thousands of soldiers. I again quote from page 30:—

"In the year 1812–14 the young auxiliary nation was called upon to undergo a severe ordeal through the United States declaring war against Great Britain, partly because of sympathy with France and partly through misunderstandings between the two Governments. The United States naturally selected Canada as the first object of attack. The position of the two countries was very unequal. Canada was totally unprepared for the conflict. She had less than 6,000 troops to defend 1,500 miles of frontier. Her entire population was under 300,000, while that of the United States was 8,000,000. Despite this startling disparity the Canadians, rallying as one man to the loyal support of their Government, bore themselves so nobly throughout the two years' struggles which ensued, that when it ended the advantage lay clearly upon their side, and the victories of Queenstown Heights and Chateauguay are to-day pointed to with the same patriotic pride as the Englishman takes in Waterloo or the Frenchman in Austerlitz."

Our celebrated historian Garneau, at page 188 of the English translation, says:—

"The result of the campaign of 1812, in which the zeal and spirit of the Gallo-Canadian population rivalled British courage and loyalty, was a practical justification of the sage and conciliatory policy of Sir George Prevost. This worthy Governor assembled the Chambers on the 29th December. He informed them that, in virtue of the power

entrusted to him, he called out the whole of the colonial militia, and expressed his liveliest satisfaction at the public spirit, orderliness, firmness, love of country, and respect for religion and the laws which had been manifested by all ranks of the people. Such a conduct as theirs, he observed, would make their country respected at home and redoubtable abroad."

It might be objected that in 1837 there was a revolution; but that revolution occurred in Upper Canada as well as in Lower Canada, and only few men took part in it. I shall not enter into the details, but everyone knows that the great majority of the people remain perfectly loyal to the Crown. When Canada was attacked by the Fenians, our French Canadian battalions were called upon to march to the front. None of them hesitated one moment, and everywhere along the frontier, at the points of danger, we saw French Canadian troops ready to give their lives in defence of the British flag. Lately when there was a rebellion or trouble in the North-West, two French Canadian battalions were called out; and no one hesitated a moment. They went to the front, they executed all orders given them, and not for one moment was their loyalty suspected, and when they returned they received praise from the authorities of the country. The Governors which England so carefully selects, have recognised our loyalty on many different occasions. Lord Dufferin, Lord Lorne, and other noble statesmen who have represented the Queen in this country, have all expressed themselves most emphatically on this matter. Lord Dufferin, whose name has remained dear to all hearts in this country, used the following words in 1878, and I like to repeat them, because these sentiments are calculated to promote harmony, peace, and contentment in this country:—

"Year by year I have had better opportunities of appreciating the devotion of the inhabitants of the Province of Quebec to the throne and Government of the Queen, and to the interests of the Empire, and nothing has given me greater pride than to observe, when a cloud of war recently threatened Great Britain, that Her Majesty's French Canadian subjects were not a whit behind their English, Scotch, and Irish fellow citizens in testifying their willingness to rally to the defence of her dominions.

"It is quite true that the distinctions of race which exist within the borders of Canada complicate to a certain degree those problems of government with which the statesmen of the country are periodically called upon to deal, but the inconveniences which may sometimes arise from this source are more than counterbalanced by many advantages which ensue from it. I do not think that ethnological homogeneity is an unmixed benefit to a country. Certainly, the least attractive characteristic of a great portion of this continent is the monotony of many of its outward aspects, while I consider it fortunate for Canada that her prosperity shall be founded on the co-operation of different races. The inter-action of national idiosyncrasies introduces into our existence a freshness, a variety, a colour, an eclectic impulse, which otherwise would be wanting, and it would be most faulty statesmanship to seek their obliteration. My warmest aspiration for this province has always been to see its French inhabitants executing for Canada the functions which France herself has so admirably performed for Europe. Strike from European history the achievements of France, subtract from European civilisation the contributions of France, and what a blank would be occasioned."

Lord Lorne, in answer to an address presented to him by the St. Jean Baptiste Society, said:—

"I have obeyed a pleasant call in being amongst you to-day to testify my respect for our French Canadian fellow citizens and my appreciation of the value of the element furnished by its noble and gallant race in influencing for good our young and Canadian nationality. I am here to show how much I prize the loyalty evinced by you on all occasions towards Her Majesty the Queen, whose representative I am."

I need not adduce more proofs of our loyalty; but it is not without reason that we are loyal. It is a sentiment, but it is based upon principle; it is based upon our faith and upon our interest. At all times our clergy have taught the people of the Province of Quebec or of any part of this continent to be loyal. I may quote as far back as 1791. The following words were spoken by Mgr. Plessis in the cathedral of Quebec, in the course of his funeral discourse over the remains of Mgr. Briand. I quote this because it will convince everyone that if we are loyal we are essentially so, and we know why we are loyal.

"Our conquerors," said Mgr. Plessis, "regarded (at first) with a jealous eye and a lowering brow, inspired in us feelings only of detestation or aversion. We cannot be

“ persuaded (for the time) that a race of men, strangers to our soil, to our language, to our laws, to our worship, could ever be willing to render to Canada an equivalent for what it lost by changing its masters. Generous nation! which has made us aware by so many evidences how ill-founded were our prepossessions; industrious nation! which has developed the earth’s fecundity, and explored its hidden riches; exemplary nation! that in critical times taught the attentive world wherein consists that liberty which all men aspire to obtain, but so few know how to keep within proper bounds; pitying nation! which has just welcomed with so much humanity the most faithful yet worst used subjects of that realm to which ourselves once belonged; beneficent nation! which daily gives us men of Canada fresh proofs of its liberality. No, no! your people are not enemies of our people, nor are ye the despoilers of our property, which rather do your laws protect; nor are ye foes of our religion to which ye pay all due respect. Pardon us, then, for that, our first (and now past) distrustfulness of a foreign race, whose virtues, being as yet unexperienced by us, we had not the happiness to know; and if, after being apprised of the overthrow of the monarchy and the abolition of the only right worship (*le vrai culte*) in France, and after experiencing for 35 years the gentleness of your domination, there remains still among us some natures purblind enough, or of such an evil disposition as to revive past antipathies or to awaken in the popular mind disloyal wishes (*désires criminels*) to revert to French supremacy—let Britons be assured that such beings are rare among us; and we beg that what may be true of the malcontent few, will not be imputed to the well-disposed many. . . . Mr. Briand’s maxim ever was, that true Christians and sincere Catholics are (and must be) all obedient subjects of their legitimate sovereign. He had learned from Jesus Christ that we must render to Cæsar what belongs (of right) to Cæsar; Saint Paul has taught him that every soul should be (voluntarily) submissive to established authority; that he who resists it is in opposition to God himself, and thereby merits damnation; he had learned from the chiefest of the Apostles that the magistrate (*roi*) bears not the sword in vain; inculcating that we are to accredit him by our obedience as God’s representative (*propter Deum*); and to honour him not only in his own person, but in the person of his lawful deputies (*sive ducibus tanquam ab eo missis*). Such are, my fellow Christians, the principles of our holy religion in that regard; principles which we cannot too often impress upon your minds, or over frequently bring under your view; for they form an integral part of evangelical morality, upon which our eternal salvation depends.”

Those words were spoken in 1791. After Confederation the Bishops of the Province of Quebec, Mgr. Baillargeon, Mgr. Langevin and the others sent pastoral letters to their flocks with regard to the change of the system of Government. I will quote especially from the pastoral of Mgr. Baillargeon, dated 12th June 1867, and you will see from those remarks that the same sentiments which animated Mgr. Plessis in 1791 animated the Bishops of the Province in 1867. Mgr. Baillargeon says:—

“ CHARLES FRANÇOIS BAILLARGEON, Bishop of Tloa, &c., &c. To the Clergy, Secular and Regular, and to all the faithful in the Archdiocese, greeting and blessing in our Lord.

“ Her Majesty, our Gracious Sovereign has just issued a Proclamation by which it is ordered by virtue of an Act of the Imperial Parliament, that, dating from the 1st of July next the provinces of Canada, of Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick shall form a federal union under the name of the ‘Dominion of Canada’ The State thus formed shall possess a common legislature which shall concern itself with the greater interests of the whole confederated territory; but this State shall be divided into four provinces distinct, each possessing a local legislature occupied with the particular interests of the province. In this way Lower Canada, henceforth separated from Upper Canada, shall form under the new régime a separate Province which shall be styled ‘The Province of Quebec.’

“ This order of things having been established by competent authority, at the request also of our representatives in the Canadian Legislature, there remains nothing for us, my very dear brethren, but to submit to it with a good grace; to do so is for us all a duty imposed by conscience. If, during the century and more since our country was ceded to Great Britain, the form of our government has changed several times, let us remember that the essence of authority does not vary, but remains ever the same. Authority is requisite for the maintenance of all human society, and experience has shown us into what misfortunes those peoples fall who venture to throw it aside.

“ Do not let us forget, my very dear brethren, the wholly Divine origin of this authority which fact has been so often disregarded in our so-called era of enlightenment.

It is to God that we must ascend in order to discover its source; it is He himself who has delegated it to men for the preservation of the community fresh from His hands.

“ ‘To God alone,’ says the Apostle Jude, ‘belongeth dominion and power’ (verse 25). ‘By the kings reign and princes decree justice,’ saith the Lord in the Book of Proverbs (ch. 8, v. 15). Jesus Christ teaches us our duties towards those in authority when he says, ‘Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s.’ (St. Matthew, ch. 22, v. 21.) St. Paul saith, ‘Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers; for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power withstandeth the ordinance of God.’ (Romans, ch. 13 v. 1–2). And in order further to convince us, he adds, ‘Wherefore ye must needs be in subjection, not only because of the wrath, but also for conscience’ sake.’ (Romans, ch. 5, v. 5.).

“Therefore, my very dear brethren, inasmuch as the federal union which is going into operation, proceeds from lawful authority, you will regard it as a law for yourselves, and you will obey the command of God by obeying it in all sincerity. It is, besides to your interest to do so, as it is a matter of conscience, in order that it may result in the common good, and in this way secure the benefits to individuals. Soon you will be called upon to chose those who either in the Federal Parliament or in the local Legislature will work to put into practice the new Constitution. You will then guard against giving your votes in favour of those who are disposed to fight against it or prevent its working, but you will give them to citizens proved and acknowledged as having at heart the wish to make it useful in promoting the greatest good of the country.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, you may go amongst our parish priests in Lower Canada, and you will find that every one of them—men of talent and science as they are—you will find that they teach to those who surround them that they must from the bottom of their hearts pay obedience to the laws, and be faithful and loyal to the Crown. That is one of the reasons why we are loyal. It is also our interest to be loyal. In this country we enjoy the fullest freedom that citizens of any country may expect. We practice freely our religion, we talk our language, we enjoy our own customs, and we live in peace and harmony with all the different races and creeds of the Dominion. We enjoy a constitution which we admire, and we are proud of being British subjects, because we belong to a country which has mastered nearly the whole world, and because the constitution of that country is based on an experience of centuries, and assures the liberty of the people. We are loyal because we find freedom, justice, and peace under that constitution. We do not believe—for my part I do not believe—and I know that I express the views of my constituents, when I say that they do not believe in the republican form of government under which a president or an executive becomes an autocrat for four years after an election. We believe in the British constitution, under which the majority of the people are always and every moment commanding. We believe that, with the civilisation and enlightenment of the present century, the people are fully able to govern themselves by themselves; and this is the sense of the form of government we have received from England. Of course, we would feel some pride in being our own masters, in having no colonial tie; but, Mr. Speaker, the advantages we derive from that tie—the protection of the British flag all over the seas, and our more intimate relations with the English people—fully compensate for the want of that sentiment of pride in being our own masters. Besides, if in years past England has been perhaps unfair to Canada, of late years, I must say, she has become more and more just, she has been extending greater liberties to Canada, she has come to look upon us as one of her most important possessions, one of her possessions most able to govern itself; and we have the pleasure of seeing every day that English statesmen are learning more about Canada, and are coming more to respect her and to give her full protection. I find in an English author a *résumé* of the benefits which we derive from British connexion. Dr. Withrow, in his “History of Canada,” says:—

“The conquest of Canada by the British was the most fortunate event in its history. It supplanted the institutions of the middle ages by those of modern civilisation. It gave local self-government for abject submission to a foreign power and a corrupt court. It gave the protection of the *Habeas Corpus* and trial by jury instead of the oppressive tribunals of feudalism. For ignorance and repression it gave cheap schools and a free press. It removed the arbitrary shackles from trade and abolished its unjust monopolies. It enfranchised the serfs of the soil and restricted the excessive power of the *seigneurs*. It gave an immeasurably ampler liberty to the people and a loftier impulse to progress

than was before known. It banished the greedy cormorants who grew rich by the official plunder of the poor. The waste and ruin of a prolonged and cruel war were succeeded by the reign of peace and prosperity; and the pinchings of famine by the rejoicings of abundance. The *habitants* could now cultivate their long-neglected acres free from the molestation of Indian massacres or the fear of British invasion. Even the conquered colonists themselves soon recognised their improved condition under their generous conquerors."

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have kept our civil laws, but we have also with thanks and gratitude received from England her criminal laws, and I believe that the criminal laws of England are as perfect as human genius and experience can make them. Our civil laws, based on the Roman laws, are also admirable and are respected in all the tribunals of the world. Under this system of laws we feel happy and contented. So, Mr. Speaker, you see some of the reasons why we are loyal. The more we know of our English-speaking friends in this country, the more we learn to appreciate them; and I may say that if among those who do not know us there may be sentiments against us, those sentiments soon disappear when we have opportunities of mutual intercourse and are enabled to know each other more perfectly. We admire the qualities of the English-speaking subjects of Britain, and they seem to regard the qualities of our race with pleasure also. I think, on this continent, by mutual agreement, by mutual forbearance, we may live in harmony under the protection of the British flag, and approach the consummation dreamed by many of our people—that there may be a great Canadian nation composed of different races, but all animated with the desire of fostering the general welfare of all. In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I will with pleasure repeat the words of one of our most popular and celebrated public men, Sir Etienne Pascal Taché: That the last gun that would be fired in defence of the British flag on this continent might very well be fired by a French Canadian.

Sir John A. Macdonald: When I first saw the motion of my hon. friend on the paper, the only doubt in my mind was whether there was any special occasion for the commons of Canada to renew the assurance of their loyalty towards Her Majesty. If I had any doubt whatever, it has been more than removed by the clear and lucid statement of my hon. friend in moving the resolution. I cordially agree with every word of his eloquent remarks, and I hope and believe that the House will respond to the resolution and to the sentiments which my hon. friend has expressed, as my hon. friend has just stated, the conversation which I sought with him was simply for the purpose of suggesting for his consideration some verbal alterations, because I thought it well that if possible the resolution should be received and carried without any amendment or suggestion of amendment; and my hon. friend was kind enough to view with favour some of the suggestions I made. I hope that the desire expressed by my hon. friend, that this resolution should be adopted by the House without any controversial remarks or any statement which in any way might impair the effect which my hon. friend's address ought to have in this House and in the country and out of the country, will be realised. I shall say no more, Mr. Speaker, except that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice has suggested an amendment which did not occur to me, but which is perfectly correct: that is, that the address should, according to the ordinary form of addresses to Her Majesty, begin, "Most Gracious Sovereign." However, I cordially agree with everything my hon. friend has said. I believe the resolution truly expresses the sentiments of the representatives of the people and of the whole people of Canada; and after hearing him, I am of the same opinion as he is, that this is a very opportune occasion, under all the circumstances, for expressing the sentiments contained in the resolution.

Mr. Laurier: I am also of opinion that perhaps there was no occasion for my hon. friend moving such an address as this. We all appreciate the motives which have induced him to do so; but the resolution itself, unless it were coupled with the remarks which have just fallen from the First Minister, would almost imply that there was some necessity for renewing our expressions of loyalty to the British Crown. Now it is useless to say that there is no such necessity whatever coming from any quarter, because from all quarters of Canada there is nothing but the most unswerving loyalty to the British Crown at this moment, and devotion and attachment to the person of Her Majesty. The great qualities that Her Majesty has exhibited as Queen and as woman during a long career have made the question of loyalty not only a feeling of duty, but a personal feeling in the heart of every one of her subjects. What I am afraid of, however, is that there is a mistake made sometimes, that what is mistaken for disloyalty is nothing more

or less than the natural anxiety which all Canadians naturally have as to their future. I thank my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) who has spoken for the race to which he and I belong, for the way in which he has alluded to the French Canadians. He has alluded to the fact that in the first year of Her Majesty's reign our compatriots rose in rebellion against the Crown; but I repeat what he stated, that the fair and generous treatment which we have ever since received, and which I hope we will ever receive in the future, has converted that sentiment of bitterness into a sentiment of devotion to the British Crown. My hon. friend, however, said that our aim was to create a great nation on this side of the ocean. Well, if this is our aim, as it is, to create a great nation on this side of the ocean, based, as I hope, on British institutions, this brings us to the fact that our connexion with Great Britain cannot remain for ever what it is at the present day. As long as our powers of self-government, which we now enjoy, are adequate to our national requirements, for my part I endorse every word which is contained in this address, but—I speak with all candour—I do not expect that Canada will remain for ever a colony. There is no necessity to enter into this question at present. Now our citizenship is adequate to our requirements, but I think our condition might be improved and this might be the subject of further discussion. I cannot lose sight of the fact that at present there is a movement in favour of Imperial federation. That movement implies that our present relations with Great Britain might be improved. It does not follow that our relations with Great Britain are deemed unsatisfactory, but simply that they might be improved. I agree with the sentiment that our relations with Great Britain may be improved, whether in the way indicated or in any other way, but, whatever may be the future relations of this country to Great Britain, as long as we remain as we are to-day, with the great measure of liberty which we have received from Great Britain, we are quite happy to express our feeling of attachment to the Crown of England and to the person of Her Majesty.

Mr. Mitchell: It may not be inopportune for me to make a few remarks on such a proposition as this. I endorse every sentiment which has been uttered by the mover of the resolution (Mr. Mulock), and I listened with pleasure to the repetition of the history of the loyalty of our French fellow-subjects to the Throne of England. I may say that I looked upon it with a little suspicion when it was first introduced, because I thought it might imply some antagonism to our neighbours and kinsmen on the south of the line, but I think that the present resolution will not be looked upon as in any way antagonistic to them. I believe it is the interest of this country to maintain the most friendly relations with the people of the United States, and, as I understand the statement of the mover of the resolution, he was induced to take this step mainly in order to correct the impressions which our friends on the south of the line might have obtained from statements made to them, or from the press, as to the sentiments or the loyalty of the people of Canada. I have been pleased to hear the expressions from both sides of the House in reference to our loyalty to the Throne and Constitution of England. I am as loyal as any man in this country. I am no annexationist. I am no advocate for independence. But, as my hon. friend, the leader of the second-rate party in this House—because I recognise three parties, and, perhaps, for all I can tell, there may be four parties—has stated, I recognise that Canada cannot and will not always remain a colony; but I am willing to abide the tide of events. We have made a success as a colony. We have had prosperity; perhaps not always as great as many might desire. We have had just laws; perhaps not always executed as justly as some of us might expect. But we have had peace and prosperity in this land; we have under the ægis and protection of the greatest nation in the world, attained to a position which, notwithstanding what certain statesmen in England some 15 or 20 years ago may have said as to the weakness of Canada, prevents anyone now from denying that we are a source of strength to the home country, and must be so as long as we remain in connexion with her. Long may it be before that connexion is severed; but, I may say, that it cannot remain in harmony and with satisfaction to the people of Canada if the interests of Canada are neglected or overlooked. I make this one observation not to raise any discussion on a motion of this kind—for I would deprecate that—but simply to tell the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, that it is his duty and that of his Government, when they are sending this address to Her Majesty, to inform her Ministers that there are some people at all events, in this Parliament of Canada who think that the interests of Canada have for some time past not been receiving that attention and protection to which they are entitled. I will not particularise now this question to which I allude. Everyone here understands to what I refer. I only hope that the Government, in sending this address to

the Home Government, will represent that, if Canada shows a fealty to the English Crown and a desire to aid in the protection of the Empire, she has a right to expect a protection from the Empire in regard to the rights which really belong to it, and in connexion with which that fealty is given. In conclusion, I may say that there are some political doctors who, of late, have promulgated vague ideas under the name of Imperial Federation as to the advantage which the Empire and Canada might gain from the creation of a central authority in London with colonial representation. We are progressing satisfactorily now, and I want these political doctors to leave us alone. We are satisfied with the relations which Canada has with the Empire at present, and they had better leave us alone. If they imagine that we will submit to any sort of taxation dictated by a body assembled in London, they will find that no one possessing any sense in Canada will consent to anything of the kind. There is no man of sense in Canada who would consent to it. I merely throw this suggestion out now in order that, when we are sending this devoted and loyal address to Her Majesty, as representing the sentiments of the people of Canada, we should also let Her Majesty's Ministers know that if they countenance, as some have countenanced, this agitation for a change in our relations, based upon giving up a certain portion of our liberties, the people of Canada are not unanimous, at all events, and I believe there is only a fragment of them that feel inclined in that way. I felt it a duty to myself, as a representative man, when we are sending this address, that we should also let them know that there are some things in which our relations to the Empire, and to the Executive of the Empire, might be very much improved in the interests of Canada.

Mr. Patterson (Essex): Representing a remote part of Canada, which is to some extent cut off from the rest of the Dominion, I may be permitted to say that I cordially join in the sentiments of the mover of this resolution. I would not have trespassed upon the time of the House were it not that I have seen in newspapers lately some reference to my constituency, and to the town in which I live. Well, Mr. Speaker, although I do not think it necessary to contradict any newspaper report, I take this opportunity to say there is no truth in the newspaper statements derogatory to the loyalty of my constituency, or of the town of Windsor in which I live. I believe it as loyal a town as is to be found in Canada, and I would like no easier task than to contest that constituency with an annexationist. I may say that it gave me a very large majority at the last general election, and I am very certain that no question of annexation was then put forward. Some statements have been made affecting a fellow townsman of mine, Mr. Solomon White, lately a member of the provincial Legislature. I have Mr. White's personal assurance that what he did say was, that if our relations were to be changed, if there was to be any constitutional change in the direction of independence, while he is perfectly satisfied with our relations with the mother-country now existing, rather than support independence he would go in for political union with the United States. While I do not echo his sentiments in that regard, I think there are men in this House, and a good many men in the country, who would agree with him. I think he has a perfect right, as we all have, to exercise our own judgment as to the future, because we all must look forward to some future for this country. For my part, I hope the time is far distant when there may be any severance of the tie binding as to the mother-country. I believe there is no possibility of annexation to the United States under their present constitutional system. Our own constitution rests on a far higher basis of liberty; we are more in touch with popular sentiment, and the people have a more direct control of those who serve them in a public capacity. During a lifetime I have had opportunities of witnessing the two forms of government, and I have no hesitation in saying that all my sympathies are with our own system, and all my energies will be devoted to supporting and continuing the system of government which we possess. I heartily endorse the sentiments of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) in the address which he has moved in this House this afternoon.

House divided on motion of Mr. Mulock.

YEAS :

Messieurs Amyot,
Archibald (Sir Adams).
Armstrong.
Audet.
Bain (Soulanges).
Bain (Wentworth).

Messieurs Baird.
Barnard.
Barron.
Bécharde.
Bell.
Boisvert.

Yeas—*continued.*

Messieurs Borden.	Messieurs Jamieson.
Bowell.	Joncas.
Bowman.	Jones (Digby).
Boyle.	Kirk.
Bryson.	Kirkpatrick.
Burdett.	Labrosse.
Cameron.	Landerkin.
Campbell.	Landry.
Cargill.	Lang.
Carling.	Langelier (Quebec).
Carpenter.	Langevin (Sir Hector).
Caron (Sir Adolphe).	La Rivière.
Cartwright (Sir Richard).	Laurier.
Casey.	Livingston.
Casgrain.	Lovitt.
Charlton.	Macdonald (Sir John).
Choquette.	Macdonald (Huron).
Cimon.	Mackenzie.
Cochrane.	McCarthy.
Colby.	McCulla.
Cook.	McDonald (Victoria).
Corby.	McIntyre.
Costigan.	McKay.
Coughlin.	McKeen.
Coulombe.	McMillan (Huron).
Couture.	McMillan (Vaudreuil).
Curran.	McMullen.
Daoust.	McNeill.
Davis.	Madill.
Dawson.	Mara.
Denison.	Marshall.
Desaulniers.	Masson.
Dessaint.	Meigs.
Dewdney.	Mills (Bothwell).
Dickinson.	Mitchell.
Doyon.	Moffat.
Dupont.	Moncrieff.
Earle.	Montplaisir.
Ellis.	Mulock.
Ferguson (Renfrew).	Neveux.
Ferguson (Welland).	O'Brien.
Fisher.	Paterson (Brant).
Flynn.	Patterson (Essex).
Foster.	Perley.
Freeman.	Perry.
Gauthier.	Pope.
Geoffrion.	Porter.
Gigault.	Purcell.
Gillmor.	Putnam.
Godbout.	Rinfret.
Gordon.	Riopel.
Grandbois.	Robertson.
Guay.	Robillard.
Guillet.	Roome.
Haggart.	Ross.
Hale.	Rowand.
Hesson.	Rykert.
Hickey.	Ste. Marie.
Holton.	Scriver.
Hudspeth.	Scuple.
Innes.	Smith.
Ives.	Somerville.

Yeas—continued.

Messieurs Sproule.
Sutherland.
Taylor.
Temple.
Thérien.
Thompson (Sir John).
Tisdale.
Trow
Tupper.
Turcot.
Tyrwhitt.
Vanasse.
Waldie.

Messieurs Wallace.
Ward.
Watson.
Weldon (St. John).
Welsh.
White (Cardwell).
White (Renfrew).
Wilmot.
Wilson (Argenteuil).
Wood (Brockville).
Wood (Westmoreland).
Wright—161.

NAYS :

None.

Mr. Mulock moved that the said address be engrossed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Mulock moved that an address be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General, praying him to lay the address at the foot of the Throne.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Mulock moved that the address be presented to His Excellency by such members of the House as are members of the Queen's Privy Council.

Mr. Landerkin : Are they loyal? You had better present it yourself.

Motion agreed to.

No. 2.

LORD KNUTSFORD to LORD STANLEY OF PRESTON.

MY LORD,

Downing Street, July 9, 1890.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship's Despatch of the 9th ultimo,* and to acquaint you that I have laid before the Queen the loyal address, unanimously voted in the House of Commons of the Dominion Parliament, which accompanied it.

Her Majesty was pleased to receive this address very graciously and to command me to convey to the Speaker, through your Lordship, an expression of Her pleasure at receiving this renewed proof of the loyalty and devotion of the Canadian House of Commons and of Her subjects generally in the Dominion.

I have, &c.
(Signed) KNUTSFORD.

Lord Stanley of Preston, G.C.B.

* No. 1.

LONDON: Printed by EYRE and SPOTTISWOODS,
Printers to the Queen's most Excellent Majesty.
For Her Majesty's Stationery Office.