

CANADA.

EMANCIPATE

YOUR

COLONIES!

AN UNPUBLISHED ARGUMENT,

BY

JEREMY BENTHAM.

LONDON:

EFFINGHAM WILSON, ROYAL EXCHANGE.

1838.

One Shilling.

“ The expectation of a rupture with the Colonies has struck the people of Great Britain with more terror than they ever felt for a Spanish Armada, or a French invasion. Under the present system of management Great Britain derives nothing but loss from the dominion which she assumes over her Colonies.”—SMITH. *Wealth of Nations*, chap. vii. *Colonial Policy*, A.D. 1776.

“ That England has benefited immensely by the loss of her North American Colonies, is a fact no one has attempted to deny. Yet she spent the incredible sum of £75,000,000 in attempting to retain possession ; a monstrous error in policy indeed ; for she might have enjoyed the same benefits, that is to say, emancipated her Colonies, without expending a sixpence ; besides saving a profusion of blood, and gaining credit for generosity, in the eyes of Europe and posterity.”—SAY. *Political Economy*, chap. xix. *Of Colonies and their Products*, M.D. 1820, Paris.

“ Colonies are the offspring of Monopoly. They add nothing to the wealth, and nothing to the strength of an empire. They are WAR-BREEDERS !”—DR. THOMAS COOPER. *Elements of Political Economy*, chap. xii. *On Colonies*. Columbia, U.S. 1829.

“ The state of the Trade with CANADA may be referred to, in proof of what has now been stated. It employs a large number of ships and seamen : and seems to a superficial observer highly valuable. In truth and reality, however, it is very much the reverse. Two-thirds and more of the trade with CANADA is forced and factitious ; originating in the oppressive discriminating duty of forty shillings a load imposed on timber from the north of Europe, over and above what is imposed on that brought from a British Settlement in North America. This obliges us to resort to CANADA, whence we import an inferior article at a higher price ! The disadvantages of this impolitic system are numerous and glaring.”—MACULLOCH. *Statistical Account of the British Empire*, 1837, chap. iii. *Colonies and Dependencies*.

DEDICATION.

To the Right Honorable LORD VISCOUNT MELBOURNE,
First Lord of the Treasury, &c. &c.

MY LORD,

I dedicate to your Lordship's instruction the following admirable argument of BENTHAM—"EMANCIPATE YOUR COLONIES"—at a critical moment of your Lordship's personal reputation and political power. CANADA may be the grave of your Lordship's Cabinet, if this second War by Great Britain to perpetuate Colonial dependence and misgovernment is unwisely prosecuted.

Start not, my Lord, at the boldness of the advice : it is the sage counsel of the most profound writer on Political Science, enforced by the most enlightened Economists of Europe and America.

Revolutionized France, in 1789, conferred on BENTHAM the honorary distinction of Citizenship. In January 1790, the new Citizen acknowledged the compliment paid to his political character, not by any fulsome panegyric on the French Revolution, but by the following Address to the Convention, demonstrating the vital truths of his precept,—“EMANCIPATE YOUR COLONIES.” M. TALLEYRAND (then a zealous Republican) can inform your Lordship, that this Address was mortifying to the pride and military spirit of France, at war with her West-India Colonies, and was therefore suppressed. St. Domingo was lost, and profitably lost to the French Nation. The Negro even burst asunder the fetters imposed upon him by the Gallican Whites, and with fearful indignation announced his independence; declaring that the natives of Africa were a species of the human race, not different from nor inferior in body or mind to the White

inhabitants of Europe. "I am a man," eloquently writes the Black Legislator of Hayti, DE VASTÉY, emancipated and self-governed. "I feel it in the whole of my being. I possess the faculties, mental and corporeal, which mark my affinity to a Divine original, and I feel humbled at finding myself compelled to enter into a serious refutation of such puerilities, such idle sophisms, to convince men like myself that I am their fellow. My soul, indignant at this excess of irrationality and falsehood, compels me, in my turn, to doubt the claims of those to the appellation of men, who can dare to enter upon the discussion of a question no less impious and immoral than absurd."*

Did France suffer by the emancipation of her sable-coloured colonists, except in the loss of blood and treasure sacrificed in an unsuccessful contest? M. SAY, the most celebrated of French Economists, in drawing the parallel with the English Colonies of North America, will answer the question.—

"That England has benefited immensely by the loss of her North American colonies, is a fact no one has attempted to deny. Yet she spent the incredible sum of 1,800,000,000 *fr.* in attempting to retain possession; a monstrous error in policy indeed; for she might have enjoyed the same benefits, that is to say, have emancipated her colonies, without expending a sixpence; besides saving a profusion of gallant blood, and gaining credit for generosity in the eyes of Europe and of posterity.

"The blunders committed by the ministers of George III. during the whole course of the first American war, in which, indeed, they were unhappily abetted, by the corruption of the parliament and the pride of the nation, were imitated by Napoleon, in his attempt to reduce the revolted negroes of St. Domingo. Nothing but its distance and maritime position prevented that scheme from proving equally disastrous with the war of Spain. Yet, comparatively, the independence of that fine island might have been made equally productive of commercial benefit to France, as that of America had been to England. It is high time to drop our absurd lamentations for the loss of our colonies, considered as a source of national prosperity. For, in the first place, France now enjoys a greater degree of prosperity, than while she retained her colonies; witness the increase of her population. Before the revolution, her revenues could maintain but twenty-five millions of people: they now support thirty millions, (1819). In the second place, the first principles of political economy will teach us, that the loss of colonies by no means implies a loss of the trade with them. Wherewith did France before buy the colonial products? with her own domestic products to be sure. Has she not since continued to buy them in the same way, though sometimes of a neutral, or even an enemy?"

* Reflections on Blacks and Whites, by DE VASTÉY, in answer to the Ex-Colonist MAZERES against SISMONDI.

Your Lordship may further advantageously consider M. SAY's general reflections on Colonial Policy, and on the dangers to which every minister is exposed in its guidance.—

“ The ancients, by their system of colonization, made themselves friends all over the known world ; the moderns have sought to make subjects, and therefore have made enemies. Governors, deputed by the mother-country, feel not the slightest interest in the diffusion of happiness and real wealth amongst a people, with whom they do not propose to spend their lives, to sink into privacy and retirement, or to conciliate popularity. They know their consideration in the mother-country will depend upon the fortune they return with, not upon their behaviour in office. Add to this the large discretionary power, that must unavoidably be vested in the deputed rulers of distant possessions, and there will be every ingredient towards the composition of a truly detestable government.

“ It is to be feared, that men in power, like the rest of mankind, are too little disposed to moderation, too slow in their intellectual progress, embarrassed as it is at every step by the unceasing manœuvres of innumerable retainers, civil, military, financial, and commercial, all impelled, by interested motives, to present things in false colours, and involve the simplest questions in obscurity, to allow any reasonable hope of accelerating the downfall of a system, which for the last three or four hundred years must have wonderfully abridged the inestimable benefits, that mankind at large, in all the five great divisions of the globe, have, or ought to have derived from the rapid progress of discovery, and the prodigious impulse given to human industry since the commencement of the sixteenth century. The silent advances of intelligence, and the irresistible tide of human affairs will alone effect its subversion.”*

ADAM SMITH, in his *Wealth of Nations*, an authority, as professor of Logic and Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow, not underrated by your Lordship, has clearly expounded the principles, an adherence to which would quickly dispel your Lordship's Canadian embarrassments. In the chapter on Colonial Policy, published in 1776, in the memorable year of the Declaration of Independence by the United States, ADAM SMITH thus endeavoured to awaken his generation to the fictitiousness of the value set upon Colonial dominion.—

“ The monopoly of the colony trade besides, by forcing towards it a much greater proportion of the capital of Great Britain than what would naturally have gone to it, seems to have broken altogether that natural balance which would otherwise have taken place among all the different branches of British industry. The industry of Great Britain, instead of being accommodated to a great number of small markets, has been principally suited to one great market. Her commerce, instead of running in a great number of small channels, has been taught to run principally in one great channel. But the whole system of her industry and commerce has thereby been rendered less secure ;

* Say, *Traité d'Economie Politique*, tom. i.

the whole state of her body politic less healthful than it otherwise would have been. In her present condition, Great Britain resembles one of those unwholesome bodies in which some of the vital parts are overgrown, and which, upon that account, are liable to many dangerous disorders scarce incident to those in which all the parts are more properly proportioned. A small stop in that great blood-vessel, which has been artificially swelled beyond its natural dimensions, and through which an unnatural proportion of the industry and commerce of the country has been forced to circulate, is very likely to bring on the most dangerous disorders upon the whole body politic. The expectation of a rupture with the colonies, accordingly, has struck the people of Great Britain with more terror than they ever felt for a Spanish armada, or a French invasion. It was this terror, whether well or ill grounded, which rendered the repeal of the stamp-act, among the merchants at least, a popular measure. In the total exclusion from the colony market, was it to last only for a few years, the greater part of our merchants used to fancy that they foresaw an entire stop to their trade; the greater part of our master manufacturers, the entire ruin of their business; and the greater part of our workmen, an end of their employment."

"The monopoly of the colony trade, therefore, like all the other mean and malignant expedients of the mercantile system, depresses the industry of all other countries, but chiefly that of the colonies, without in the least increasing, but on the contrary diminishing, that of the country in whose favour it is established."*

After treating of the evils of colonial *possessions*, ADAM SMITH candidly admits the difficulties of a parent government in conceding *emancipation* in the face of the prejudices which then gave support to sinister interests, but hesitates not to shew the peace, the profit, and the honour to the whole nation to be obtained by such a course, were those prejudices dispelled, as now happily they are.—

"Under the present system of management, therefore, Great Britain derives nothing but loss from the dominion which she assumes over her colonies.

"To propose that Great Britain should voluntarily give up all authority over her colonies, and leave them to elect their own magistrates, to enact their own laws, and to make peace and war as they might think proper, would be to propose such a measure as never was, and never will be adopted, by any nation in the world. No nation ever voluntarily gave up the dominion of any province, how troublesome soever it might be to govern it, and how small soever the revenue which it afforded might be in proportion to the expense which it occasioned. Such sacrifices, though they might frequently be agreeable to the interest, are always mortifying to the pride of every nation; and, what is perhaps of still greater consequence, they are always contrary to the private interest of the governing part of it, who would thereby be deprived of the disposal of many places of trust and profit, of many opportunities of acquiring wealth and distinction, which the possession of the most turbulent, and, to the great body of the people, the most unprofitable province seldom fails to afford. The most visionary enthusiast would scarce be capable of proposing

* Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, M'Culloch's ed. vol. iii. c. 7, p. 26. 27. 36.

such a measure, with any serious hopes at least of its ever being adopted. If it was adopted, however, Great Britain would not only be immediately freed from the whole annual expense of the peace establishment of the colonies, but might settle with them such a treaty of commerce as would effectually secure to her a free trade, more advantageous to the great body of the people, though less so to the merchants, than the monopoly which she at present enjoys. By thus parting good friends, the natural affection of the colonies to the mother-country, which, perhaps, our late dissensions have well nigh extinguished, would quickly revive. It might dispose them not only to respect, for whole centuries together, that treaty of commerce which they had concluded with us at parting, but to favour us in war as well as in trade, and, instead of turbulent and factious subjects, to become our most faithful, affectionate, and generous allies; and the same sort of parental affection on the one side, and filial respect on the other, might revive between Great Britain and her colonies, which used to subsist between those of ancient Greece and the mother city from which they descended.”*

Your Lordship was educated under the personal tutorage of Professor MILLAR; and in the halls of the Glasgow University imbibed the principles of civil liberty and political science from the public lectures of the most eminent men in Scotland. Your Lordship is also conversant with the works of the eminent class of writers created by the intellectual labours of SMITH and MILLAR. Consider, then, the question of Canada only in reference to British trade. Mr. M'CULLOCH, in his valuable Statistical Account of the British Empire, exposes the comparative value of our commercial intercourse with the Baltic and the Canadas.—

“A country which founds a colony on the liberal principle of allowing it to trade freely with all the world, necessarily possesses considerable advantages in its markets from identity of language, religion, customs, &c. These are natural and legitimate sources of preference of which it cannot be deprived; and these, combined with equal or greater cheapness of the products suitable for the colonial markets, will give its merchants the complete command of them. But all attempts at forcing a trade with colonies are sure to be pernicious, alike to the mother country and the colony; and make that intercourse a source of poverty and ill-will, which, if let alone, would be a source of reciprocal advantage.

“The state of the trade with Canada may be referred to in proof of what has now been stated. It employs a large number of ships and seamen; and seems, to a superficial observer, highly valuable. In truth and reality, however, it is very much the reverse. Two thirds, and more, of the trade with Canada is forced and factitious; originating in the oppressive discriminating duty of 40s. a load imposed on timber from the north of Europe, over and above what is imposed on that brought from a British settlement in North America. This obliges us to resort to Canada, whence we import an inferior

* Idem. p. 45-7.

article at a much higher price. The disadvantages of this impolitic system are numerous and glaring. To a manufacturing country, having a great mercantile and warlike navy, timber is an *indispensable necessary*; and yet, instead of supplying ourselves with it where it may be found best and cheapest, we load the superior and cheaper article with an exorbitant duty, and thus do the most we can to make our houses and ships be built, and our machinery constructed, of what is inferior and dear! But the mischief does not stop here. By refusing to import the timber of the North of Europe, we proportionally limit the power of the Russians, Prussians, Swedes, and Norwegians, to buy our manufactured goods; while, by forcing the importation of timber from Canada, we withdraw the attention of its inhabitants from the most profitable employment they can carry on; that is, from the cultivation of the soil, and make them waste their energies in comparatively disadvantageous pursuits! Such, either in a less or a greater degree, is the uniform result of all attempts to interfere with the natural order of things, and to force a trade—whether with a colony or a foreign country, matters not—that would not otherwise be carried on.”*

A member of your Lordship’s government, Sir HENRY PARNELL, in his practical work on *Financial Reform*, when out of office, will bear testimony to the price paid by this greatest of *commercial* nations for the extraordinary *privilege* of resorting to the worst market.—

“ With respect to Canada (including our other possessions on the continent of North America) no case can be made out to show that we should not have *every commercial advantage* we are supposed now to have, if it were made an *independent state*. Neither our manufactures, foreign commerce, nor shipping, would be injured by such a measure. On the other hand, what has the nation lost by Canada? *Fifty or sixty millions* have already been expended: the annual charge on the British treasury is *full £600,000 a year*; and we learn from the Second Report of the Committee of Finance, that a plan of fortifying Canada has been for two or three years in progress, which is to cost *£3,000,000* !”

I could multiply authorities, home and foreign; I could cite TURGOT, FRANKLIN, TALLEYRAND, STORCH, CHARDOZO, DR. THOMAS COOPER, MALTHUS, BROUGHAM, HUSKISSON, BARING, RICARDO, TORRENS, SENIOR, (even MRS. MARCET or MISS MARTINEAU might *awaken* Lord GLENELG to a recollection of the elements of colonial policy); but I will close these quotations by the conclusive demonstration by JAMES MILL of the real *use and purpose* of Colonial Possessions,—*to produce or prolong bad government*.

“ If colonies are so little calculated to yield any *advantage* to the countries that hold them, a very important question suggests itself. What is the reason

* Statistical Account of the British Empire, ed. 1837, vol. i. p. 595.

that nations, the nations of modern Europe, at least, discover so great an affection for them? Is this affection to be *wholly* ascribed to mistaken views of their utility, or partly to other causes?

"It never ought to be forgotten, that, in every country, there is 'a Few,' and there is 'a Many;' that in all countries in which the government is not very good, the interest of 'the Few' prevails over the interest of 'the Many,' and is promoted at their expense. 'The Few' is the part that governs; 'the Many' the part that is governed. It is according to the interest of 'the Few' that colonies should be cultivated. This, if it is true, accounts for the attachment to colonies, which most of the countries, that is, of the governments of modern Europe, have displayed. In what way it is true, a short explanation will sufficiently disclose.

"Sancho Panza had a scheme for deriving advantage from the government of an island. He would sell the people for slaves, and put the money in his pocket. 'The Few,' in some countries, find in colonies a thing which is very dear to them; they find, the one part of them, the precious matter with which to influence; the other, the precious matter with which *to be* influenced;—the one, the precious matter with which to make political dependents; the other, the precious matter with which they are made political dependents;—the one, the precious matter by which they augment their power; the other, the precious matter by which they augment their riches. Both portions of the 'ruling Few,' therefore, find their account in the possession of colonies. There is not one of the colonies but what augments the number of places. There are governorships and judgeships, and a long train of *et ceteras*; and above all, there is not one of them but what requires an additional number of troops, and an additional portion of navy. In every additional portion of army and navy, beside the glory of the thing, there are generalships, and colonelships, and captainships, and lieutenantships, and in the equipping and supplying of additional portions of army and navy, there are always gains, which may be thrown in the way of a friend. All this is enough to account for a very considerable quantity of affection maintained towards colonies.

"But beside all this, there is another thing of still greater importance; a thing, indeed, to which, in whatever point of view we regard it, hardly any thing else can be esteemed of equal importance. The colonies are a grand source of wars. Now wars, even in countries completely arbitrary and despotic, have so many things agreeable to the ruling few, that the ruling few hardly ever seem to be happy, except when engaged in them. There is nothing to which history bears so invariable a testimony as this. Nothing is more remarkable than the frivolous causes which almost always suffice for going to war, even when there is little or no prospect of gaining, often when there is the greatest prospect of losing by it, and that even in their own sense of losing. But if the motives for being as much as possible in war are so very strong, even to governments which are already perfectly despotic, they are much stronger in the case of governments which are not yet perfectly despotic, of governments of which the power is still, in any considerable degree, limited and restrained.

"There is nothing in the world, where a government is, in any degree, limited and restrained, so useful for getting rid of all limit and restraint as wars. The power of almost all governments is greater during war than during peace. But in the case of limited governments, it is so in a very remarkable degree.

"In the first place, there is the physical force of the army, and the terror

and awe which it impresses upon the minds of men. In the next place, there is the splendour and parade, which captivate and subdue the imagination, and make men contented, one would almost say happy, to be slaves. All this surely is not of small importance. Then there is an additional power with which the government is entrusted during war. And, far above all, when the government is limited by the will of only a certain portion of the people; as it is, under the British government, by the will of those who supply with members the two Houses of Parliament; war affords the greatest portion of the precious matter with which that will may be guided and secured. Nothing augments so much the quantity of that portion of the national wealth which is placed at the command of the government as war. Of course, nothing puts it in the power of government to create so great a number of dependents, so great a number of persons, bound by their hopes and fears to do and say whatever it wishes them to do and say.

“Of the proposition, that colonies are a grand source of wars, and of additional expense in wars; that expense, by which the ruling few always profit at the cost of the subject many; it is not probable that much of proof will be required.

“With regard to additional expense, it can hardly appear to be less than self-evident. Whenever a war breaks out, additional troops and an additional portion of navy are always required for the protection of the colonies. Even during peace, the colonies afford the pretext for a large portion of the peace establishment, as it is called; that is, a mass of warlike apparatus and expense, which would be burdensome even in a season of war. How much the cost amounts to of a small additional portion, not to speak of a large additional portion, of army and navy, Englishmen have had experience to instruct them; and how great the mischief which is done by every particle of unnecessary expense, they are daily becoming more and more capable of seeing and understanding.

“That the colonies multiply exceedingly the causes and pretexts of war is matter of history; and might have been foreseen, before reaping the fruits of a bitter experience. Whatever brings you in contact with a greater number of states, increases, in the same proportion, those clashings of interest and pride, out of which the pretexts for war are frequently created. It would exhibit a result which probably would surprise a good many readers, if any body would examine all the wars which have afflicted this country, from the time when she first began to have colonies, and would show how very great a proportion of them have grown out of colony disputes.”*

I will not longer detain your Lordship from a consideration of the *principles* which are now heaving the social structure of Canada from its basis, and which are so unanswerably elucidated in the comprehensive argument of BENTHAM, by any discussion of the superficial “question” of CANADA, as the mere point upon which these principles are brought to issue, is called,—whether the grievances now alleged by the Canadians are or are not well-founded,—whether the causes

* Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica.

of complaint do or do not justify the Colonists in their struggle for national independence,—whether your Lordship's government can or cannot succeed in coercing Canada again to political submission. The PUBLIC PRESS of GREAT BRITAIN and *Ireland*, now penetrating every crevice of society, will amply discuss these secondary subjects. In the commencement of the American War the whole country and the entire press supported the British ministry. A reaction however speedily followed the national fanaticism. And do not, my Lord, be misled by sinister or subservient writers. The *Daily Press* of London, of any or even every party, cannot long impose on the public mind even captivating errors. Provincial Journals and cheap publications are instructors who have broken down the monopoly and who share the influence of the self-styled National Press. The last Sunday of the old year brought forth seven metropolitan weekly newspapers which dispersed in one day upwards of *one hundred thousand* stamped copies of articles on Canada,—all more or less exciting the sympathy of the People in favour of the Colonists, and representing our colonial brethren as “more sinned against than sinning.”* This is not the age, my Lord, to confine your observation exclusively to the votes of the House of Commons or to the opinions of a defective Electoral Body. Woe betide that British Statesmen, who, in 1838, and on such a question, blindly closes his eyes to *real Public Opinion*.

PUBLIC OPINION, my Lord, when imminent affliction challenges its judgment, will now penetrate the surface, and both perceive and declare that no Colony *is* or *can* be well governed, and that no Colonists are without real grievances. A succession of Governors of a Colony, and of Commissioners of Inquiry—alternately changed by *party*, and generally selected from aristocratic “*connexion*”—never can consistently or wisely govern a far distant colony. As *strangers* they will be always miserably ignorant of the character, interests, habits, and manners of the governed; and, thus uninformed, they must be necessarily subject to the influence of local caballists or the action of prejudiced colonial functionaries. First-class public men of the mother country will

* 30th December, 1837. The Spectator, Examiner, Weekly True Sun, Weekly Chronicle, Guide, London Dispatch, and Planet.

seldom accept colonial appointments; honest public men are rarely offered governorships. Is it possible for elective local Legislative Assemblies to co-exist advantageously with Supreme Councils self-elect or nominated in Downing-Street, Westminster? Is your Lordship's "Colonial Department" constructed so as to direct with unerring wisdom the political administration of our vast Colonies—distant communities, numbering ten times the population of the parent country,—differing in climate, origin, language, religion, civil institutions, and forms of local government! Can your present Colonial Secretary of State, and two English Barristers promoted to secretaryships, guide or assist your Lordship in the present crisis of Canada? Your memorable *Resolutions*, transmitted to Canada without means to enforce obedience, were to satisfy and tranquillise the lower province. BURKE said, in his celebrated speech on conciliation with America,—“Sir, to speak the plain truth, I have in general no very exalted opinion of the virtue of *paper* government.” Your Lordship, however, may yet follow the eloquent counsel of BURKE, on that occasion,—“*Lay the first stone of the Temple of Peace!*”

My Lord, it would be grossly unjust to place to your Lordship's account the “dead weight” of Colonies strangling this country. It is not the creation of your Lordship's Administration, but one of the precious legacies left us by Toryism. Your Lordship is now, however, responsible for the colonial administration of the *existing* system; and the Canadas, with two millions of human beings, are now partially dependant on your personal decision,—for WAR or for PEACE. Your own countrymen have given you credit, whatever your past political conduct or present views, for sagacity to discern the “spirit of the age,” and for moral courage to conform to it. Will you, on this question, sustain or irrevocably lose that character which alone upholds you as a Statesman and Prime Minister?

On the 16th of January Parliament re-assembles. You will then have to elect your course, which, once taken, cannot be altered by your Lordship, however succeeding Premiers may endeavour to retrace your Lordship's steps.

You may transport troops and munitions of war to the Canadas; you may spill torrents of human blood; you may succeed in partially arraying Upper Canada against the

Lower Province; you may temporarily put down "insurrection" and "revolt;" but the ultimate consequences of such vain and miserable policy will be EMANCIPATION. The blow is struck. The final result of the civil contest is merely a question of *time*. Canada will be henceforth (as was prophesied by Dean TUCKER of our former Transatlantic States) a charged cannon, ready for instant explosion when the match should be applied. We taught the Pennsylvanians the use of arms in militias embodied against the Indians. The Lower Canadians were instructed in the use of arms when they were arrayed by Great Britain in the last war against the United States. If your Lordship enrolls the volunteers of Upper Canada against the Lower Province, will they be hereafter more governable than at present, or the less liable to disaffection? If you "put down" the insurrection to-day, will you suppress a second revolt to-morrow? Will not the flame of independence only smoulder for a time, and burst out with redoubled fury? Will not revenge and a rapidly-increasing population eventually overcome the Mother Country? Your temporary success, my Lord, will ensure only ultimate failure. Combine, then, an enlightened and pronounced remedial policy with every security for the rights and property of British settlers. Call to mind the American War, and the false influences which ruinously misled the NORTH Administration. "The sanguine people of this country would do well, though the retrospect cannot be pleasing, sometimes to turn back their thoughts upon this unhappy contest,—to recollect that measures, triumphantly voted wise and just, and vigorous, proved only wasteful folly,—that a spirit of arrogant domination, and heedless indifference to the rights of others, lost the wing of an empire,—that there may be abounding loyalty, with very deficient prudence;—and that counsel called factious, because opposed to the wishes of the Court, may, when misfortune shall have silenced both sycophancy and prejudice, come to be acknowledged as the oracles of wisdom."* Close your eyes and ears to the sinister misrepresentations of "City merchants" and interested political advisers. Lord BROUGHAM, in a work which does honour to his early years, sensibly portrays the two interests,—that of a body of merchants, favoured by the aristocracy, and that of

* Edinburgh Review, vol. xiii. p. 153. Life of Washington.

an enlightened, unbiassed, and tax-paying public,—which are still diametrically opposed on Colonial Policy :—“ While the
 “ Mercantile theory favoured the establishment of colonies
 “ by every possible means, and viewed them as a certain
 “ mine of wealth ; that of the Economists considered them
 “ as a drain to the resources, and a diversion to the force of
 “ the mother country. Statesmen of the former school (as
 “ almost all statesmen have been) encouraged them, as the
 “ scene of rich and secure monopoly. The converts of the
 “ latter doctrine (whose influence on public affairs has unfortunately been very slender) disapproved both of the
 “ Colonies and of the colonial monopoly.”*

The majority of the London merchants, my Lord, will hark you on to war as they urged Lord NORTH to conflict with the Colonies in 1765. Bristol, one of the chief *entre-pôts* of North American commerce, in 1766 sent an energetic representation to Parliament from her principal merchants and inhabitants that the city would be infallibly ruined by the acknowledgement of American independence. Separation, however, became a matter of necessity ; and ten years had not elapsed when the Bristol merchants petitioned Parliament for leave to enlarge and deepen their port, which, instead of being deserted, as they had apprehended, was incapable of receiving the influx of additional shipping poured into its docks by the commerce of the Americans. Liverpool has since numbered two hundred thousand inhabitants created by American trade.

It is now haughtily said in regard to Canada, “ What ! give up the river St. Lawrence ? ” My Lord, it was demanded of Lord NORTH,—“ Will you then abandon to rebels the rivers Delawere, Susquehannah, and Mississippi ? ” Have those great feeders of the Atlantic Ocean subsequently proved less productive sources of wealth to Great Britain ? Lord CHATHAM once declared in Parliament, “ that the British Colonists had *no RIGHT to manufacture even a nail for a horse-shoe.* ” More nails, however, are now exported from Staffordshire to the United States in one year than England then manufactured in the same period. Lord CHATHAM afterwards implored the Parliament to concede independence to the States, in the memorable counsel—“ RECTITUDE IS DIGNITY, OPPRESSION

* An Inquiry into the Colonial Policy of the European Powers, by Henry Brougham, Esq. 1803, vol. i. p. 7.

ONLY IS MEANNESS, AND JUSTICE HONOUR." The general cry in England in 1764 was, "The people of NEW-ENGLAND were a body of cowards, who would at once be humbled into submission by a hostile look from our troops; the *appearance* of English troops would be sufficient, and all would be soon over, *sine glade*." Victory, however, declared for the *new* Englanders. Thus your Lordship was told that "French Canadians would not fight," when your despatches proclaimed at the same moment that they fought "like tigers."

My Lord, you were warned in the preceding Session of the certain effect of your memorable "Resolutions." You did not listen to reason. Dr. Price records the temper of his times, under similar circumstances; a parallel to your present situation:—

"All who knew any thing of the temper of the Colonies saw that the effect of all this sudden accumulation of vengeance, would probably be not intimidating but exasperating them, and driving them into a general revolt. But our ministers had different apprehensions. They believed that the malecontents in the Colony of *Massachusetts* were a small party, headed by a few factious men; that the majority of the people would take the side of government, as soon as they saw a force among them capable of supporting them; that, at worst, the Colonies in general would never make a common cause with this province; and that, the issue would prove, in a few months, order, tranquillity and submission.—Every one of these apprehensions was falsified by the events that followed." *

The Ministerial Press tells us, that if the Canadians have grievances, they have no cause for their declaration of independence. It is now admitted that the United States in 1764 had such cause; it was denied when they first cast off submission to Great Britain, and false motives were ascribed to "traitors." Dr. Price wisely met the fallacy:—"I have heard it said by a person in one of the first departments of the state, that the present contest is for DOMINION on the side of the colonies, as well as on ours: and so it is indeed; but with this essential difference: *we* are struggling for dominion over OTHERS; *they* are struggling for SELF-dominion—the noblest of all blessings." †

My Lord, I warn your Lordship that the WAR with

* Observations on Civil Liberty, &c. and the Justice and Policy of the War with America, ed. 1766, pp. 91-92.

† Idem, p. 74.

CANADA may involve the fate of our entire COLONIAL SYSTEM. Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick,—our colonial possessions in the East and the West Indies,—may be revolutionized by its consequences. The democratic spirit, engendered by this contest, will act and re-act throughout Great Britain and our vast dependencies. And bear in mind, my Lord, that in CANADA, if the advice be not now followed, yet necessity will, at no distant period,—it may be through fields of blood and disgrace,—bring second scorn upon a late obedience to Bentham's great precept of honour and of peace,—

“ EMANCIPATE YOUR COLONIES !”

PHILO-BENTHAM.

London, 1st Jan. 1838.

