

of the Imperial Government with the Government of Canada. During that period there has been a Liberal Government in England, with a Conservative Government in Canada, and now there is a Conservative Government in England and a Liberal one in Canada, but so good an understanding exists that no one is ever apprehensive of difficulty. I proceed to consider—

2ndly. The inconsistencies of the essayist. In order to establish his case he was bound to prove that dependencies could not be satisfactorily governed. "The very name 'colony' is obnoxious, derived from a very peculiar set of institutions, those Roman Colonies which had no life of their own, but were merely the military and political outposts of the Imperial Republic." All the successful colonies were those "independent from the beginning." "Even New England, the germ and organizer of the American communities, was practically independent for a long time after her foundation." The writer proceeds to descant on the sufferings endured by dependencies, citing from an old speech pamphlet of Mr. Roebuck's that "our colonies have not been governed according to any settled rule or plan," that "caprice and chance have decided generally every thing connected with them," and that if there has been success it has been obtained "in spite of the mischievous intermeddling of the English Government, not in consequence of its wise and provident assistance." This, it is said, is "the refrain of almost all the works on the Colonies." England cannot have colonies or dependencies because England is the vast and motley mass of voters including, since "the Conservative Reform Bill, the most uneducated populace of the towns, people who in politics do not know their right hand from their left." Even "Phineas Finn" is cited as an authority to prove how little England is competent to maintain a Colonial system. Phineas reports of the people of Marylebone, "not one man in a thousand cares whether the Canadians prosper or fail to prosper. They care that Canada should not go to the States, because though they don't love the Canadians they do hate the Americans." This, the essayist asserts, is not "an unfair picture of a Londoner's normal frame of mind." And very similar is that of the inhabitants of Dorsetshire and Tipperary. I grant it all, just as I grant that a Canadian Londoner, in his home on the banks of the Canadian Thames, cares not whether the inhabitants of Marylebone prosper or fail to prosper. The Canadians have just as much influence over English questions, as the English over theirs; and when it is triumphantly asked, "When did a Canadian question influence an English election," I simply reply, "When did an English question influence a Canadian election." But I have dwelt, I trust, sufficiently on the essayist's argument against the Colonial connexion, founded on the incompetency of English electors to govern remote dependencies. I purpose now to show, from another part of the same essay, that the argument has not the slightest application. Referring to the "course of events" in regard to the colonies of Spain, Portugal, France, and Holland, the essayist proceeds: "If Canada has been retained, it is by the reduction of Imperial supremacy to a form. Self-government is independence—perfect self-government is perfect independence; and all the questions that arise between Ottawa and Downing Street, including the recent questions about appeals, are successively settled in favour of self-government." What then becomes of the argument based on the "uneducated populace" of the English towns, and on the opinion of Phineas Finn's Maryleboner? The truth is, that "the refrain of almost all the works on the Colonies" had reference to that old system when, to use the language of the essayist, "Government was jobbed by an oligarchy; whereas the statement that 'self-government is independence, and that all the questions that arise between Ottawa and Downing Street are successively settled in favour of self-government,' is a faithful description of the present Canadian system.

In his bitter censure of Parliamentary Government the essayist has fallen into a glaring inconsistency. That Government is said to be the bane of Canada, because "there is no question on which parties can be rationally or morally based," consequently the parties have become "mere factions, striving to engross the prizes of office." Such allegations abound through the essay, but, on the other hand, there are some admissions which would indicate to any experienced politician that there are important questions on which parties may properly be divided.