

with us shall be properly served. It is incumbent on Great Britain to do all this, that is if Whig Radicalism, with its peace at any price popularity, has not emasculated the pride and honor of the nation to the level of Manchester Quakerism; and if it would be judged by the tone of some of its journals that is the happy condition to which the once proud and haughty people whose national honor was the breath of their nostrils, has been reduced. The *London Morning Post*, with a whine of imbecility, puts forth the following extraordinary announcement:

LONDON, May 26.—The *Morning Post* is confident that the loyal and energetic action of the American President will place the Fenians in a proper light before the world, as being the enemies of mankind.

So it needed the President's proclamation to define what treason to British rule meant, the *Post* will likely inform the world by and by that the Dutch have captured Holland.

The *Telegraph* boldly endorses the action of the Washington Executive:

"The *Morning Telegraph* says President Grant has acted with loyalty and honor."

Indeed. Suppose the I. R. B. has established its headquarters at Paris, that the French Executive allowed them to exercise all the functions of an independent and recognized government,—issue money, collect arms, drill soldiers, organise cannon foundries and depots for the avowed purpose of invading England, and with this knowledge receive their leaders in their different capacities at Court. That some fine morning this grand army was en route for England, and just as they landed at Dover, having first received every facility the railways and steam vessels of France could give and were allowed to concentrate munitions of war as near the frontier as they could get, and that the French Emperor had then issued a proclamation denouncing the desperadoes, would that be looked on by the people of England as "acting with loyalty and honor?" We think the *Telegraph* would hardly give utterance under those circumstances to a sentiment displaying such deplorable ignorance of the true state of the case and the folly of the British Executive.

The *Times* writes with a little more, and only a little, light on the subject:

"The *Times* says that while the President's proclamation in regard to the Fenians itself is satisfactory, the absence of American troops on the border to carry out its provisions is deplorable. This, however, it says is not surprising, as troops are not usually quartered on the frontier. Troops should be sent to Canada immediately, and Canada should forward to the front all the soldiers she can spare. Canada must have no tenderness for this second offence. Marauders must be treated as robbers, ruffians and murderers."

But its advice to Canada is singularly ill-timed, and its attempt at excusing the action of the Washington Government both silly, ridiculous, and uncalled for. What is the real duty of one state to another in times of peace? Is it not to see that its subjects do not injure their neighbors, and

where do quarrels arise if not on the frontiers? Is it the interior of a country that should be guarded or her boundaries? Common sense would answer the latter. And the *Times* would do well to lay aside the stereoscope through which it obtains dissolving views of the notions of the people and government of the United States and see what all the rest of the world can easily perceive, that the whole of this action is meant to bully, abuse, and render Great Britain ridiculous in the eyes of the world, ruin her prestige, and get her into a quarrel in which the preponderance of force would be against her. Is it not apparent enough that these raids on Canada are only meant to embroil the two countries so that a rebellion could be got up in Ireland, in which the States would act the part of a *neutral*, as she is doing to Cuba. If Gladstone, Bright & Co. are not as demonted as the people outside British local politics give them credit for they will have a fleet of ironclads in American waters with the slightest possible delay, and by demanding the political or civil death of Fenianism in the States give peace to Ireland, and save money in reality by making the cost of its government less. Whatever may be thought of those people at home it is very evident that we can only look on them in one light, and that is as "American citizens," for whose conduct their Government must be held accountable.

The recent debate in the Imperial Parliament on Mr. Torren's motion has brought out some strange ideas on the part of the English Whig-Radical Press, prominent amongst which is that of the Colonies being a source of trouble and expense from which no corresponding advantage is derived. The *Times* (London) especially is decided on the question of the creation of *new nationalities*, a monomania which appears to have possessed Whigs and Radicals in England since their treachery fostered a rebellion in the Thirteen Colonies, out of which they created the United States and lost America to the British Crown. The *Times* of the 27th April says:

"The Australian Colonies have been allowed to govern themselves, because it has been seen that it is better for them that their inhabitants should regulate their own affairs and settle for themselves their forms of political life. The apprehension excited by the bare suggestion that at some distant time the nominal ties between such Colonies and the United Kingdom should be broken shows, however, that the gift of self-government, as it has been hitherto received, has not developed all the qualities that might have been expected from it. Although the subjection of Victoria and New South Wales to the Mother Country is practically limited to the acceptance of a Governor who does not govern, it has still been sufficient to preserve a feeling of dependence in the Colony. There is apparent in Canada a similar disposition to lean on the United Kingdom. This fact is sufficient to prove that to suggest the immediate emancipation of either Colony would be premature, because it

would be impossible to establish independent communities where the authority of independence is wanting; but it must strengthen the conviction of those who look upon emancipation as the proper result of their development. Our Colonies have outgrown dependence, but want the self-reliance of independence. They have ceased to be children, but they shrink from the isolation of manhood. It is for their interest and glory that they should look forward to the time when they shall assume their proper position in the world's history; and it is for the glory and renown, and for the safety and dignity, of the United Kingdom that we should recognize a confraternity of English-speaking nations as a better ideal than the maintenance of a nominal dominion which would fall to pieces under any serious agitation through the mere weight of its separate parts."

The *Times* is entirely mistaken if it supposes, or leads its readers to suppose that Canada wants "to lean on the United Kingdom" in the sense indicated. The Canadian people believe themselves to be as much a part of the Empire as Cornwall, and besides are not in a condition to assume that role of independence which the English Whig-Radicals wish to force upon us. In the first place we have not accumulated wealth, we cannot, therefore, hope to create and keep aloft a naval armament commensurate with our extent of territory. In the next we are on the frontiers of an unscrupulous neighbor numbering nearly ten times our population; and lastly, we wish to leave to our children and the people of Great Britain the finest and richest Dominion on the Continent of America.

In the very infancy of this Colony, when England was engaged in a deadly struggle on the Continent of Europe—the Peninsular war—a handful of Colonists, aided by 4000 British troops, held Canada against the whole power of the United States, who, with the good faith which has ever characterised her, endeavored to create a diversion in favor of the French, which would have been successful if this Colony was not able to checkmate the movement. Will the *Times* pretend to say that the loss of the Colonies will lessen the taxation of the British ratepayer? would it add one ton to the commerce of the Empire or increase the profits in any degree of the British manufacturer? In fact, what would be the effect on Great Britain by a declaration of independence from all her Colonies? In our view it would be at once the destruction of her commercial and maritime supremacy and her descent to the condition of Holland.

A revolution of this kind could not be effected quietly, and it would tend, by the inevitable laws of reaction, to diminish the wealth of the *drab*, or Manchester school of politicians, while it would not add to that of the United Kingdoms. Another event would follow, although that is probably in contemplation by the Gladstone-Bright party, and that would be the separation of Ireland and her total independence of Great Britain, for the same rule would apply to