

universities and clergy to dispute with him. In July 1581 he was apprehended along with Parsons and two other agents at Lyford in Berks, and thrown into the Tower, on a charge of having excited the people to rebellion, and holding treasonable correspondence with foreign powers. Having been found guilty, he was condemned to death, and was executed at Tyburn, Dec. 1, 1581, with several others of his order. He is admitted to have been a man of great abilities, an eloquent orator, a subtle philosopher, and able diplomatist; and he is praised by all writers, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, not only for his talents and acquirements, but also for the amiability of his disposition. A full account of the Jesuit mission in which Campian took part will be found in Froude's *History of England*, vol. xi.

CAMPLI, a town of Italy, in the province of Abruzzo Ulteriore I., 5 miles north of Teramo. It has a cathedral, an abbey, and several churches and convents. Population, 7770.

CAMPOBASSO, a city of Italy, the capital of the province Molise, 53 miles N.N.E. of Naples. It is situated on the ascent of the mountain Monteverde, around which it forms a kind of amphitheatre. It is fortified, and contains a cathedral, the ruins of a castle, a small theatre, a hospital, and various other public buildings. The most important industry is the making of steel and cutlery, and there is a considerable export trade in corn. Population, 14,090.

CAMPOBELLO, a town of Sicily, in the province of Trapani, 7 miles E.S.E. from Mazzara. In the neighbourhood are the interesting quarries of Rocca di Cusa, from which the blocks were obtained for the buildings of the ancient Selinus. Population, 5575.

CAMPOBELLO DI LICATA, a town of Sicily, in the province of Girgenti, and 20 miles E.S.E. of the city of that name, on a tributary of the Salso. It possesses valuable sulphur mines. Population, 6301.

CAMPOMANES, PEDRO RODRIGUEZ, CONDE DE (1710–1802), a Spanish statesman and writer, was born in Asturias about 1710, or, according to other authorities, in 1723. From 1788 to 1793 he was president of the council of Castile; but on the accession of Charles IV. he was removed from his office, and retired from public life, regretted by the true friends of his country. His first literary work was *Antiquidad Marítima de la Republica de Cartago*, with an appendix containing a translation of the *Voyage of Hanno* the Carthaginian, with curious notes. This appeared in a quarto volume in 1756. His principal works are two admirable essays, *Discurso sobre el Fomento de la Industria Popular*, 1774, and *Discurso sobre la Educacion Popular de los Artesanos y su Fomento*, 1775. As a supplement to the last, he published four appendices, each considerably larger than the original essay. The first contains reflections on the origin of the decay of arts and manufactures in Spain during the last century. The second points out the steps necessary for improving or re-establishing the old manufactures, and contains a curious collection of royal ordinances and rescripts regarding the encouragement of arts and manufactures, and the introduction of foreign raw materials. The third treats of the guild laws of artisans, contrasted with the results of Spanish legislation and the municipal ordinances of towns. The fourth contains eight essays of Francisco Martinez de Mata on national commerce, with some observations adapted to present circumstances. These were all printed at Madrid in 1774 and 1777, in five volumes. Count Campomanes died in 1802.

CAMUCCINI, VINCENZO (1775–1844), the most famous of the modern historical painters of Italy, was born at Rome in 1775. He was educated by his brother Pietro, a picture-

restorer, and Bombelli, an engraver, and, up to the age of thirty, attempted nothing higher than copies of the great masters, his especial study being Raffaele. As an original painter, Camuccini belongs to the school of David. His works are rather the fruits of great cleverness and patient care than of fresh and original genius; and his style was essentially imitative. He enjoyed immense popularity, both personally and as an artist, and received many honours and preferments from the Papal and other Italian courts. He was appointed director of the Academy of San Luca and of the Neapolitan Academy at Rome, and conservator of the pictures of the Vatican. He was also made chevalier of nearly all the orders in Italy, and member of the Legion of Honour. His chief works are the classical paintings of the Assassination of Caesar, the Death of Virginia, the Devotion of the Roman Women, Young Romulus and Remus, Horatius Codes, the St Thomas, which was copied in mosaic for St Peter's, the Presentation of Christ in the Temple, and a number of excellent portraits. He died at Rome September 2, 1844.

CAMUS, CHARLES ERIENNE-LOUIS (1699–1768), a French mathematician and mechanic, was born at Crécy-en-Brie, near Meaux, on the 25th August 1699. At the age of twelve he was able to maintain himself by teaching at the Collège de Navarre in Paris, where he devoted himself to mathematics, civil and military architecture, and astronomy. He became Associate of the Académie des Sciences, professor of geometry, secretary to the Academy of Architecture, and member of the Royal Society of London. In 1736 he accompanied Maupertuis and Clairvaux in an expedition to Lapland for the measurement of a degree of the meridian, when he rendered essential service, not only as a geometrician and astronomer, but also by his remarkable skill in the mechanical arts. He died on the 2d February 1768. He was the author of a *Cours de Mathématiques* (Paris, 1766), and a number of essays on mathematical and mechanical subjects.

CANA, of Galilee, a village of Palestine, remarkable as the birthplace of Nathanael, and the scene of Christ's "beginning of miracles." Its exact site is unknown, but it is evident from the Biblical narrative that it was in the neighbourhood of Capernaum. By a tradition as old as the 8th century it is identified with *Kefr Kenna*, and by a more modern hypothesis with *Kana-el-Jelil*. The former lies about 4½ miles N.W. of Nazareth, and contains the ruins of a church and a small Christian population; the latter is an uninhabited village about 9 miles N. of Nazareth, with no remains of antiquity but a few cisterns.

CANAAN, a geographical name of archaic Hebrew origin, generally supposed to mean "depression," "lowland," and hence fitly applied to various low-lying districts of Syria, viz., Phœnicia (Isa. xxiii. 11; Josh. v. 1, where the LXX. has τῆς Φωνικίας), Philistia (Zeph. ii. 5), and the valley of the Jordan (as implied in Num. xiii. 29, cf. Josh. xi. 3). It is, however, also applied to the whole of the territory conquered by the Israelites on the west side of the Jordan (Gen. xi. 31, xii. 5; Num. xiii. 2, 17, &c.), the boundaries of which are given in Gen. xv. 18 as "the river of Egypt," (i.e., the Wady, or torrent-valley, el-Arish), and "the great river," the River Euphrates. Probably the Israelites found the name in use in the Jordan Valley, and, as a part of this was the first district they conquered, extended it to their subsequent acquisitions. We have good parallels for this extension in the use of Argos for the whole of the Peloponnese, and of Hellas for the mainland of Greece. Of course this theory implies that the original signification of the word had been forgotten, as was so often the case with Hebrew proper names. The Phœnicians likewise accepted the name of Canaan. Hecateus of Miletus (about 520 B.C.) knew Χωά as a

synonym for Φωνικία, and the same identification is found in Philo's *Sanchoniathon* (Müller's *Fragmenta Hist. Græc.*, vol. i. p. 17, vol. iii. p. 369). St Augustine, too, says that the Punic peasants, when asked what they were, replied in Punic, *Chanani* (ed. Bened., vol. iii. col. 932), and on a coin of the date of Antiochus Epiphanes, Laodicea in the Lebanon district is called "a mother, or metropolis, in Canaan" (see inscription in Schröder, *Die phönizische Sprache*, p. 275). It is remarkable that there is a trace, and no more, of the extended use of the word Canaan in Egyptian. The town nearest to Canaan, in the territory of the Shasu or Bedawin (*lit.* Brigands, cf. Heb. *shāsāh*), was called Pa-Kanana (Brugsch, *Histoire d'Égypte*, p. 145).

An instance of the confusion produced by the different uses of the term Canaan is supplied by Gen. x. 15–18, where the list of Phœnician cities is interrupted by the five Palestinian nations, the Hittites, Jebusites, &c. As De Goeje has pointed out, the original writer of the Table of Nations understood Canaan in the sense of Phœnicia—he had probably used a Phœnician chart; the interpolator, in that of Palestine (*Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1870, p. 241).

Why Canaan is placed among the descendants of Ham could only be shown by a chart of the world as known to the Phœnicians. Clearly there was a misunderstanding as to the coasts of the Red Sea.

Compare Movers, *Die Phönizier*, vol. ii. (1), pp. 4–6; Knobel, *Die Völkertafel der Genesis*, pp. 307–310; De Goeje, *Over de Namen Phœnicia in Kanaan*, Amst. 1870. (T. K. C.)

CANAANITES. Only two of the possible senses of the word Canaanite need be here referred to; for the others, see PHœNICIANS and PHILISTINES. And as one of these is included in the other, let us pass at once to the Canaanites in the larger sense, i.e., the whole group of nations conquered by the Israelites on the west side of the Jordan. The group is variously described. It is sometimes said to consist of five—Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites, Hivites, Jebusites (Exod. xiii. 5); sometimes of six, the Perizzites, i.e., *Paganî*, being added (Exod. iii. 8, 17, xxiii. 23, xxxiii. 2, xxxiv. 11; Deut. xx. 17; Josh. ix. 1, xii. 8); sometimes of seven, by including the Girgashites (Deut. vii. 1; Josh. iii. 10, xxiv. 11); once of ten, omitting the Hittites, and including the aboriginal Rephaim and three Arab tribes, the Kenites, Kenizzites, and Kadmonites (Gen. xv. 19–21). The latter, however, are clearly inserted by mistake, as they only became inhabitants of Palestine, so far as they did become such, as the reward of assistance given to the Israelites. There are only two of these nations about whom we have any collateral information—the Hittites and the Amorites. The former, however, seem also to have been included among the Canaanites by mistake. Historical evidence, both Biblical and extrabiblical, proves convincingly that they dwelt beyond the borders of Canaan; and linguistic evidence tends on the whole to show that they did not even speak a Semitic language (see HITTITES). The latter, too, were not entirely homogeneous with the other Canaanitish peoples, if the notices in Deut. iii. 11 ("Og . . . of the remnant of the Rephaim"), *ibid.* 13; Josh. xii. 4, xiii. 12, may be taken as historical. Perhaps, as Ewald suggests, they were mixed with the aborigines. A Semitic basis seems probable, but has only one linguistic fact in its favour—Semir, the Amorite name of Hermon (Deut. iii. 9), mentioned also in an inscription of Shalmaneser (*Brit. Mus. Coll.*, vol. iii. p. 5, No. 6, l. 45); personal names like Og and Sihon may easily have been Semiticized, and the name Amorite itself, being probably descriptive (see AMORITES), has no ethnological value. They are at all events un-Canaanitish in their political capacity, two considerable states having been founded by them on the east of the Jordan (Deut. iii. 8; Josh. xii. 2; Judg. x. 8, xi. 22). It will therefore be better to exclude Hittites and Amorites from the present notice.

I. It is extremely difficult to draw any distinction between

the remaining members of the Canaanitish group. As described in the early books of the Old Testament, they have a general family likeness. They are described as living in a state of political disintegration, the combined result of the Semitic love of independence and of the varied conformation of the soil. Thirty-one of their petty kings are mentioned in Josh. xii. 9–24, including the king of Hazor (afterwards reckoned to Naphtali), whose realm, i. Judg. xi. 10, is called "the chief of all those kingdoms." We find, indeed, a king of Bezek claiming to have enslaved "seventy" of the surrounding *reguli* (Judg. i. 7), but this is an altogether exceptional event, for which the loosening of authority produced by the guerilla warfare of the Israelites sufficiently accounts. Yet the isolation of the Canaanites can never have been complete. Like the Phœnicians, they will have had their federations, as appears to be implied by the title Baal-berith, or "Baal of the Covenant" (Judg. viii. 33); and hieroglyphic inscriptions tell of their alliances with the Khita or Hittites against their Egyptian suzerains. Indeed, the rebellious tendencies of the Syrian states will partly explain the inaction of the Pharaohs during the Israelitish conquest. The only injury Joshua could do to the latter would consist in blocking up the military coast-road to the north of Syria, but this was well secured by Egyptian garrisons, which Joshua did not venture to attack; while to get the Canaanites humbled without any trouble was a clear gain. That the Israelites were not immediately and at all points successful is now universally recognized. The work of many years was concentrated by tradition on a single great name; yet the Old Testament itself corrects by numberless indications the error of the more imaginative narrative. Thus the kingdom of Hazor, which had been utterly destroyed, according to Josh. xi. 10, 11, emerges again in the more accurate account of Judges (iv. 2, 3). And both Joshua and Judges (not to descend later—see AMORITES) supply evidence for the continued Canaanitish occupation of many parts of the country (Josh. xiii. 13, xv. 63, xvi. 10, xvii. 12, 13; Judg. i. 19–36). The immediate result of the invasion was, not the extinction of the old, but the addition of a new (and yet not wholly new) element, of stronger stuff but less advanced culture.

II. No doubt the Israelites at first put an end to much of which they could not discern the value, or, to use their own phrase, made it a *khérem*, a thing consecrated to God by destruction. The origin of Hebrew literature would not be such a blank if the sacred archives of Kiryath-sépher, or "the Book-city," otherwise called Kiryath-sannah, or "the Law-city" (Josh. xv. 15, 49), had been preserved. Still the attractions of culture were superior in the long run to the dictates of religious zeal. Goodly houses, vineyards, and oliveyards (Deut. vi. 10, 11) were agents more powerful even than chariots of iron. The secrets of agriculture had to be learned from the Canaanites; intercourse naturally led to intermarriage, and so a new strife arose in the field of religion, in which half the Jewish nation perished utterly, and the other half was only saved by its voluntary submission to a spiritual despotism.

III. The pages of the book of Judges are full of complaints of Israelitish infidelity, which is rightly ascribed by the compiler to mixture of blood (Judg. iii. 6). It is true that expressions like this of infidelity have only a limited accuracy. As Ewald and Kuenen have pointed out, the final editor of Judges lived in the age of the Exile, when the religion of Yahveh (miscalled Jehovah) had attained its full development. From his point of view, religious approximation to the Canaanites was wilful apostasy, because it involved the effacement of the distinction between physical and moral religion. But of this distinction the Israelites were hardly more conscious than the Canaanites

The religions of both nations were based on a feeling for the powers of nature, whether regarded as destructive and awful, as by the one, or as favourable and lovely, as by the other. Thus the one religion was stern and in tendency moral; the other soft and in tendency immoral: there was indeed a difference, but not a clear-cut distinction between them. To come to particulars,—the chief object of Canaanitish worship was the dual-natured god of life and fruitfulness, viz., Baal, or rather the Baal, i.e., "the lord," and his consort Asherah, i.e., "the happy," and so "happy-making, favourable" (as in Assyrian, Salmanu-isir, "Salman is favourable"). The masculine form is also probably a divine title, and has given its name to the tribe of Asher, as Gad ("good fortune") to the Gadites. As Movers long ago pointed out, Asherah is not identical with Ashtoreth or Astarte, whose name is philologically different, and who belongs to another type of Semitic religion. Her symbol was the stem of a tree (Deut. xvi. 21; Judg. vi. 25), though this may have been sometimes carved into an image; that of the Baal probably had the form of a cone, and represented the rays of the sun. It is these symbols which are referred to in the phrase, "the Baals and the Asherahs" (Judg. iii. 7); the "groves" of the authorized version is an evident mistranslation (see in the Hebrew or some accurate modern version, Judg. vi. 25; 1 Kings xv. 13; 2 Kings xxiii. 6). The licensed harlotry which formed part of the worship of Asherah was profoundly obnoxious to the later Hebrew writers (Num. xxv.; Deut. xxiii. 18), though, indeed, even the folk-lore of the Israelites shows traces of aversion to its attendant immorality. An illustration of this is furnished in the narrative of Sodom (Gen. xviii, xix.), which can only refer to the later Canaanites. Similarly, another writer (Gen. xv. 16) describes "the iniquity of the Amorites" as the divine justification of the Israelitish conquest. It is also the subject of a threatening passage in the Levitical legislation (Lev. xviii.), which if composed during the Babylonian exile, as is held by Graf and Kalisch, is a remarkable evidence of the tenacity of pre-Israelitish customs.

Another characteristic of Canaanitish religion, though far from peculiar to this, was soothsaying. After Israelite prophecy had broken its shell, and taken its daring flight into a more spiritual region, its first anxiety was to destroy that rival phenomenon which enslaved the minds of men to gross superstition. Hence the earnest dehortations of Isaiah (ii. 6), and of the writer of Deuteronomy (xviii. 10-14).

There was only one relic of Canaanitish times which the disciples of prophetic religion could not or would not throw aside—the old traditions. For it can hardly be doubted by uncompromising historical critics that some, perhaps many, of the narratives of Genesis are but purified versions of Canaanitish myths and legends. The most obvious examples will naturally be those stories which are attached to localities in Canaan, e.g., Luz and Beersheba. Of course the story of Melchizedek, "the king of Salem," and "priest of the most high God" (Gen. xiv. 17-24), is not one of these, being out of harmony with all our other notices of the Canaanites. It is also easily separable from the rest of the narrative, and may possibly be as late as the Maccabean period, and written in honour of the temple and its priesthood, which are glorified by being, as it were, prefigured in the patriarchal age.

IV. The question has been asked of late, whether a remnant of the old population of Palestine may not still be in existence. M. Clermont-Ganneau, following Prof. E. H. Palmer (*History of the Jewish Nation*, p. 64), answers it confidently in the affirmative. In the fellahin or peasants of the Holy Land he sees the descendants of the Canaanites, who, having been reduced to a state of serfdom, were contemptuously over-

looked by the successive hordes of conquerors. Their strange superstitious customs have been remarked by every close observer, and are evidently survivals of some early form of religion. M. Ganneau also mentions some curious legendary parallels to Biblical narratives existing among them. Dr Thomson (*The Land and the Book*, pp. 226-8) holds a similar theory about the sect of the Nusairieh in northern Syria, who are equally bad Moslems, but more probably represent the *débris* of the later Syrian paganism.

V. We have yet to speak of the ethnological relation of the Canaanites and the Israelites. The linguistic evidence points to a kinship as close as that of both to the Phœnicians. Not only are the personal names of the Canaanites (Melchizedek, Adonibezek, Adonizedek, Ornan or Aranyah, of which Araunah seems to be a corruption) pure Hebrew, but so too are the names of their cities, an evidence of still greater value, as given both in the Old Testament and in the lists of the places conquered by Thothmes III. The latter have been discovered by Mariette-Bey on a kind of triumphal arch at Karnak; they include 119 names belonging to Canaan, of which 75 have been identified with known Hebrew names of places (Mariette-Bey, in *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 1874, p. 243, &c.). The same Hebraic character is apparent in the names given in the "Travels of a Mohar" (see the *Records of the Past*, vol. ii. pp. 107-116), which have been illustrated, we understand, by the recent explorations of Lieutenant Conder. How, it has been asked, is this community of language to be accounted for? The problem is a real one to those who regard the Table of Nations (Gen. x.) as an ethnological authority, for in that document the Canaanites are classed separately from the Hebrews among the descendants of Ham. From this, as we believe, antiquated point of view, it becomes necessary to assume that the Canaanites borrowed their language from some of the genuine descendants of Shem. From the Israelites? But they spoke the language long before the Israelite immigration. From an aboriginal Semitic-speaking race? But there is no historical evidence for the existence of such a people. We are thus driven to accept the view that the Table of Nations is arranged not on an ethnological but on a geographical principle. The Canaanites will then be classed among the descendants of Ham as belonging, according to the compilers, to the southern terrestrial zone—not, however, the Canaanites, in our sense of the word, for these formed no part of the original Table (see CANAAN), but the Phœnicians. Apart from this misunderstood document there is no difficulty in admitting the affinity of the three nations, the Israelites, the Canaanites, and the Phœnicians, who all appear to have migrated successively from a Babylonian centre (see PHœNICIANS). The last to move westward were probably the Hebrews. They are generally supposed to have originally spoken an Aramaic dialect, but after entering Palestine to have adopted that of the more civilized Canaanites (see *Introductions* of Bleek and De Wette-Schrader). The only evidence, however, offered in support of this view is Gen. xxxi. 47, where the "cairn of witness" receives a Hebrew name from Jacob, an Aramaic from Laban. From this it is inferred that Laban's great-uncle Abraham must, according to tradition, have spoken Aramaic, as if Aramaic were as early a development as Hebrew, and as if the writer in Genesis had any thought of illustrating philological problems! Of any such event in the history of the Hebrews we have simply no evidence whatever.

Compare Ewald, *History of the People of Israel*, Eng. trans., vol. i. pp. 232-242; Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, Eng. trans., vol. i. chap. 1 (with note) and 4; Movers, *Die Phœnizier*, vol. ii. (1), pp. 61-82; Knobel, *Die Völkertafel der Genesis*, pp. 202, 321, 332-338; Clermont-Ganneau, "The Arabs in Palestine," in *Macmillan's Magazine*, August 1875. (T. K. C.)

CANADA

CANADA, geographically and politically, differs widely from the British colony known by that name prior to 1867. Before that date the country embraced under the name of Canada included a region about 1400 miles in length and from 200 to 400 miles in breadth, extending from the watershed west of Lake Superior eastward to Labrador. Alongside of it lay the independent British provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland, and beyond it to the north and the west the vast regions abandoned to the Hudson's Bay Company. But various causes combined to impress on Canadian statesmen the desirableness of uniting the colonies of British North America into one political confederation.

On the cession of Canada to Great Britain in 1763, its French colonists were guaranteed the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion, and equal civil and commercial privileges with British subjects. Further privileges were secured by "the Quebec Act" of 1774, whereby the old French laws, including the custom of Paris, the royal edicts, and those of the colonial intendants under the French regime, were declared binding in relation to all property and civil rights; while the criminal law was superseded by that of England with its trial by jury. The seignories, with their feudal rights and immunities, were also perpetuated; and thus, under the fostering protection of England, the colonial life of the France of Louis XV. and the regency survived in the "New France" of Canada, unaffected by the Revolution of 1792. But the whole French population at the date of the conquest did not exceed 65,000. From Great Britain, and still more from the older colonies, emigrants hastened to occupy the new territory to the north of the St Lawrence. On the declaration of independence by the revolted colonies in 1776, the loyalist refugees were welcomed by the Provincial Government, settled on land in Upper Canada, and aided with funds and farming implements; and these were followed by emigrants from Great Britain. But it was not till 1791 that the rule of a governor, aided solely by a council appointed by the Crown, was superseded by the grant of a constitution establishing the Government with an elective legislature. At the same time Upper Canada, with its purely British settlers, was made a separate province from the old French colony of Lower Canada. At this date the population of Lower Canada had increased to upwards of 130,000, and that of Upper Canada was about 50,000. According to the first strictly reliable census of 1811 it amounted to 77,000. But the increase of population of Lower Canada was in part due to the immigration of British settlers. In 1793 a Protestant bishop of Quebec was appointed by the home Government; and in 1804 a cathedral was erected for him at Quebec, on the site of the old Recollet church. Dr Jacob Mountain, the Anglican bishop, exerted himself in the cause of education. Parliament enacted the establishment of free schools throughout the parishes of Lower Canada, but to this the Roman Catholic clergy gave resolute opposition; and in various other ways a spirit of antagonism began to manifest itself between the French inhabitants and the British population.

The war of 1812 followed; and during the protracted struggle on the Canadian frontier till the signing of the treaty of Ghent in 1814, the French and British colonists were united in loyalty to England; but with the restoration of peace internal political difficulties revived. The legislative and executive councils were at open variance with the popular representative assemblies; and a new element of strife created antagonism between Upper and Lower Canada.

The position of Quebec and Montreal gave to Lower Canada a control over the exports and imports of the country; financial misunderstandings arose between the two provinces respecting their rightful share of import duties; and a proposal, first made in 1822, for a legislative union between Upper and Lower Canada, was at length carried out in 1841, accompanied by important concessions designed to confer on the majority of the representatives of the people that influence over the executive Government which constituted the essential element of responsible government in England. But while the British colonists were divided by the old English party lines, the French Lower Canadians, united by local interests, race, and religion, were able to hold the balance of power whenever the two British parties divided on points of sufficient importance to preclude a compromise. Thus while the advantages of soil and climate, the industry, and the consequent wealth of Upper Canada, enabled it to contribute an ever-increasing proportion of the revenue of the united provinces, it frequently received a very partial share in their distribution, and was liable to be outvoted on questions in which both local feeling and local interests were largely involved. This condition of things was turned to account in the party contests of the time with an ever-increasing irritation and sense of wrong on the part of the British colonists of Upper Canada, until a common feeling overrode party lines, and matters were brought practically to a deadlock.

This it was which led to the idea of a legislative union among the various British American colonies, while reserving to each the control of its own local government; and the common dangers to which they were exposed by results springing out of the great American civil war furnished additional motives to such a union. The leaders of different parties representing the various interests of the provinces, after mature deliberation, agreed to the principles of the proposed confederation, and the Imperial Government responded by giving it the requisite force of parliamentary authority. The Imperial Act, known as "the British North American Act, 1867," provided for the voluntary union of the whole of British North America into one legislative confederation, under the name of the Dominion of Canada. Thus the older provinces have preceded, even by centuries, the Dominion within which they are now embraced, and have a separate history of their own. The Dominion thus constituted consists at present of the old provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, now designated respectively Ontario and Quebec, along with Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, and British Columbia. To it also pertain the territories in the north-west still unsettled, with power to receive them into the confederacy when they acquire the requisite population and organization of provinces. Provision is also made in the Imperial Act for the admission of Newfoundland into the confederacy. It is further provided that the constitution of the Dominion shall be "similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom;" that the executive authority shall be vested in the sovereign of Great Britain and Ireland, and carried on in his name by a governor-general and privy council; and that the legislative power shall be exercised by a parliament consisting of an Upper House or "Senate," the members of which are nominated for life by summons under the great seal of Canada, and a "House of Commons," duly elected by the several constituencies of the various provinces in proportion to the relative population of each.