

left her the prestige and credit of a successful defence of Sebastopol?"

Lord Aberdeen, it is true, was premier at the time the Vienna Note was negotiated, but the office of Home Secretary was filled by Lord Palmerston, and as a member of the Cabinet, he is of course held, by Lord Elgin, justly responsible for not having had sufficient discernment, however little his colleagues might have had, to see and point out the fatal blunder which was embodied in that official document.

It is not easy to fathom Lord Elgin's exact position, with respect either to the Government, or to the war. Whether he clings to the peace party, because that party is strongest and the most likely to prevail; or he foresees the probability that the present Premier will be displaced, and is lending a hand to bring about an event that would open a door for his own promotion to office, are questions that cannot be determined very nicely by the proceedings of the meeting at Glasgow. The probability, however, is, that he is influenced by both motives combined, and that he is steering a course through the rocks and quick-sands of party politics, with a view of working himself, by dint of political dexterity, into an office of emolument and to an honourable distinction. No man is better able to do this than our late Governor-General. If a good address, an earnestness of manner, a command of appropriate language, a happy method of selecting anecdotes, and, above all, a facility of adapting himself to circumstances and making the best possible use of the materials within his reach, are recommendations for the duties of statesmanship, Lord Elgin certainly possesses them all in an exalted degree. He understands well the composition of human society, that it is made up partly of honest men, but chiefly of fools and knaves. That parties and sects are so many make-weights, that can be used successfully to pull the wires of government, by any one versed in the art; and that success is less dependent on an open straight-forward course, dictated by a dogged honesty of purpose, than on occult combinations without regard to their abstract merits, so long as they can be made instrumental to the promotion of contemplated results.

We cannot close our notice of Lord Elgin's speech, without giving place to some pertinent remarks from the London *Times*, on that portion which refers to the subject of colonial representation in the Imperial Parliament:—

"The question of colonial representation in the British Parliament is one which has occupied some attention in North America, and been advocated in some of the most extraordinary specimens of Transatlantic eloquence that it has yet been our lot to see. The orators generally place themselves on an imaginary pivot, turn their eyes north, south, east, and west, and contemplating the broad lakes and deep rivers of the new continent, draw comparisons extremely unfavourable to the geographical physiognomy of the old. Then they give us imports and exports, population as it is now, as it was 20 years ago, as it will be 20, 50, 100, years hence. They enlarge on the beauty of their women, the sturdy health of their children, the fertility of their soil, and the bracing severity of their climate, and then they triumphantly ask "Is this a country to be denied the rights of citizenship?—is this a people to be treated as an inferior race, and held in vassalage and subjection?" Our answer is short, and we beg for it the attention of Lord Elgin and of any one elsewhere may be disposed to take the claptrap view of the question. We admit the equality of our colonists, but we can admit no more. Let them, by all means, enter our Parliament, and let it be on terms of perfect equality. They claim the right to legislate for us, and, if so, we must also have the right to legislate for them. They claim a voice in taxing us, in contracting loans which we are to pay, and in saddling

us with obligations which we are to discharge. All this must, of course, be mutual. If they tax us we must tax them. If they borrow money on the security of our Ways and Means, we must also have a right to pledge theirs. If they go to participate in imperial powers they must also participate in imperial burdens. The English empire may be looked at in two points of view—either as a Sovereign State surrounded by a number of dependencies, or as a vast confederacy of equal States, each having a voice according to its populations, its wealth, or its territory. In the first case the dependencies may reasonably expect the Sovereign State to bear exclusively the burdens of the government which she retains in her own hands. In the second case it seems just that each confederate should contribute according to his ability, not only to the expense of the Imperial Government, but to the interest of the debt insured for its defence and consolidation. If the colonies are willing to be represented in the Imperial Parliament on these terms, we, on our part, see no objection; but they must look the question fairly in the face, and make up their minds whether the honour they seek be worth the price they will assuredly have to pay for it."

This is a good set-off to the crude and nonsensical ideas that have been indulged, during the last few years, by several of the pigmy sages of British North America, on a most important colonial subject. Colonial representation, however, bears on the very face of it, objections, which might occur to the most superficial observer, independent of the difficulties enumerated by the *Times*. The extent of the British Colonial possessions, the distances at which they are placed, and the dissimilarity and extent of their respective claims compared with those of the mother country, have always seemed to us insuperable impediments of themselves. So long as we give a preference to monarchical institutions, our interests will continue identified with those of Great Britain, and we will seek to perpetuate those terms of connection, which will be found mutually beneficial to the circumstances of both countries. But we think that, on a careful examination, it will appear, that those who have advocated the doctrine of colonial representation in the Imperial Parliament, have been few; and that few composed of aspiring half-fledged statesmen, possessed of more presumption than intelligence. Of course we do not mean to put Lord Elgin in this category; though he has given vent to a notion purely provincial or colonial, and thereby has made himself the representative, presumably, of an idea which the intelligence and better sense of the people of Canada would indignantly reject. In this respect, then, the mention of the subject of colonial representation, by Lord Elgin, rather redounds to our discredit. We have, it appears, to suffer patiently under the infliction piled to us by the *Times*, in consequence of our late Governor's transgression at Glasgow.

*Cæsar's Commentaries on the Gallic and Civil Wars: with the Supplementary Books attributed to Hirtius; including the Alexandrian, African, and Spanish Wars. Literally translated, with Notes.* By W. A. McDevitte, B.A., of Trinity College, Dublin, in conjunction with W. S. Bohn.

A literal translation is that in which the letters of one language are changed to those of another, without altering their powers. This could not have been what the translators of Cæsar's Commentaries intended. Their object, evidently, was to change every Latin word to its corresponding English word. That is, word for word. The book should, therefore, have been designated a *verbal translation*. That such an error as this should