

LORD MONCK ON THE COLONIAL CONNECTION.

We have been somewhat amused at seeing Lord Monck quoted as an important Imperial authority in favour of the doctrine of Colonial Independence. His Lordship, no doubt, possesses a large practical experience of Canada, and no doubt, too, some of the seeds of Colonial Independence which he sowed while in this country, have fallen upon fruitful soil, though most of them have either perished on the rock or been choked off by the luxuriant growth of a more patriotic vegetation. But the noble Viscount represents no party in Britain; when he speaks, he does so only for himself. He may be enamoured of the doctrines of the late Sir G. Cornwall Lewis, whose authority he invoked in the House of Lords, on the 14th of last month, when discussing the Colonial connection but in such a manner as to prove that His Lordship either misunderstood that authority or entertained a most erroneous conception of the existing relations between the Colonies and the Empire. Lord Monck read the following extract:

"A nation derives no true glory from any possession which produces no assignable advantage to itself or to other communities. If a country possesses a dependency from which it derives no public revenue, no military or naval strength, and no commercial advantages or facilities for emigration which it would not equally enjoy though the dependency were independent, such a possession cannot justly be called glorious."

So far is this definition, admitting it to be correct, from justifying the doctrine of Colonial independence, that with respect to nearly all the British Colonies, the direct opposite of every stated condition is either plainly demonstrable as a fact or deducible as an inference. As Lord Monck refers particularly to Canada, a brief application of Sir G. C. Lewis's conditions to the relations between this country and Great Britain, will best show how utterly inconsequential is the conclusion to which his Lordship has arrived: (1st.) As to public revenue, Canada, though not paying directly to the Imperial Exchequer, is, inferentially, a large contributor thereto, because, (2nd.) Britain enjoys large commercial advantages with Canada, larger by 200 per cent. according to population, than with the "emancipated" Colonies on her borders, a fact which is direct proof of its deriving indirect revenue. (3rd.) As to military and naval strength, Britain derives much of both from her North American colonies, by the territorial and marine bases of operations they afford; by the naval and military stores they can supply; by the strength they add to the merchant marine of the Empire, and by the number of fighting men by sea and land they would furnish in case of need. (4th.) That the facilities for emigration furnished by the colonies are greater than under independence is proved by two facts: 1st, that many of the colonies have assisted emigration from Britain; and, 2nd, that organized private bounty in Britain has assisted, and is now assisting, emigration to the colonies; but it is further and much more emphatically established by the consideration that every emigrant to an independent, and consequently foreign, state is a loss of strength to the Empire, whereas to a colony he is a gain to it.

Those who hold with the old Quaker that had Napoleon the 1st invaded and conquered England, perhaps the taxes would have been a little less, perhaps a little more, and that that would have been all the difference, will be able to sympathize with Lord Monck's opinion that the existing connection is inconvenient both to the colonies and to the Empire; but those who value nationality and their own institutions will be disposed to regard these "inconveniences" as merely the mutual responsibilities, the due discharge of which is but a small sacrifice for the mutual advantages conferred.

Lord Monck concluded his speech with the following remarks, (as reported in the *Times*):

"It may be said undoubtedly that my argument rests solely on material considerations, and that I omit all considerations respecting that sentiment or affection towards England which I know, at all events, animates one of our great colonies. My lords, I have no such intention; I would wish to cultivate that sentiment and affection for Britain and Britain's interests to which allusion has been already made. And I do not think it was a poet's dream which was present to the mind of my right hon. friend the Vice-President of the Council when he stated that at some future and not distant period he hoped to see all the members of the great Anglo-Saxon race brought together into one union, connected not by compulsory ties but by those of common origin, community of sentiment, and identity of interests. That is the direction in which my aspirations also tend. (Hear.) But before you can bring about that state of things you must produce a state of relations between the mother country and the colonies, clear, on the one hand, from any hereditary claim for protection, and, on the other, from any desire to control or rule. I believe—although more or less that policy has been disavowed by the Government—the tendency of what they are doing is in that direction. (Cheers from the Opposition benches.) That is my belief; it is for that reason that I give them my hearty support; and I hope that no opposition will induce them to depart from such a course."

His Lordship believes in a Utopian Confederation; a sort of Anglo-Saxon millenium, when "Alabama" claims will be no more; when a "common origin," embracing almost every antagonism yet developed either in race or

in religion; when "community of sentiment" between Judaism and all the degresses of social, moral, and religious discord down to Mormonism and the Agapemone; when "identity of interest," possessing every element of conflict known to commerce and civilization—shall bind this mighty empire together with cords of softest silk, and wipe out of existence those "compulsory" bonds which have heretofore held society on its foundations since the world began. It need hardly be wondered at that "before you can bring about that state of things," it will be necessary to break the Empire up into fragments, and—wait patiently for the realization of what is certainly above the ordinary conception even of a "poet's dream." With equal disregard of the meaning of language as of the significance of facts, it is also fitting that Lord Monck should still believe that the policy of the Imperial Government is exactly the reverse of what the Government has declared it to be.

There is, however, much excuse for his Lordship's vagaries on the Colonial connection. He presided over affairs in Canada at a time of exceptional trial and excitement. He was not well installed in office before the Trent affair threatened Canada with dire trouble for an act in which she had no part; and that was followed by a dozen other little excitements, kindred to the St. Alban's raid, in which England's peace was apparently jeopardised by the connection with Canada; and again came the Fenian raid, inflicted upon Canada solely because of its connection with England. Such were the grave, but exceptional, facts with which Lord Monck was brought so intimately face to face that it is little wonder he should have mistaken them for a fair exemplar of the normal condition of the relationship; hence we can give him credit for sincerity in his adhesion to the doctrine of Colonial independence, though for the reasons stated we attach but little weight to his opinion. It is worthy of remark, however, that the prominent Canadian advocates of this policy are only to be found among the men who, at one time or another, "stretched their feet under his mahogany," as the sworn advisers of the Crown, thus shewing that he was more successful as a propagandist in Canada than in England.

CANADIAN PARLIAMENT.

THE SENATE.

Wednesday, March 9.—The petition of Mr. J. R. Martin for a divorce from his wife was read and received, and the brother of the petitioner was examined at the bar of the House. The Report of the Select Committee on Contingent Accounts was adopted.

Thursday, March 10.—Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST called attention to the publication of statements from the North-West in certain newspapers before they were laid before the House. Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL had enquired into the matter, but had failed to ascertain whence the papers in question had obtained their information. On motion of Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL the bill for the relief of Mr. J. R. Martin (Divorce Bill) was read a first time. Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of the bill respecting Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange. He explained that the object of the bill was to assimilate the various laws now in force in the various Provinces. Hon. Mr. DIXIEY thought it inadvisable to alter the present arrangement in the Maritime Provinces. Hon. Mr. SANBORN thought that if great caution were not exercised in carrying out the measure proposed the results would be most mischievous to the Province of Quebec. Hon. Mr. McCULLY approved of the bill. Hon. Mr. McMASTER and Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST urged the importance of having the laws of the Provinces uniform. The bill was read a second time. On motion of Hon. Mr. SANBORN the bill respecting Official Assignees appointed under the Act of 1864 was read a second time.

Friday, March 11.—Hon. Mr. MITCHELL moved the second reading of the bill to amend the Act relating to Lighthouses, Buoys and Beacons. He explained the provisions of the bill, under which he contended that there would be more efficiency in that branch of the service, attended by less expense. Hon. Mr. TESSIER thought the measure proposed gave too great power to the Minister of Marine. Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON objected to it on the same score. Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST was afraid the bill would create conflicting authority between the departments. After some further remarks from Hon. Mr. MITCHELL, the bill was read a second time. The House then went into Committee on the Bill relating to Official Assignees, etc.

Monday, March 14.—Hon. Mr. SANBORN moved the third reading of the Bill relating to Official Assignees. Hon. Mr. ARKES moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Act relating to the Office of Queen's Printer, and explained that the object of the bill was merely to attach the office to the Department of the Secretary of State.

Tuesday, March 15.—The House went into Committee on the Bill relating to Lighthouses, Buoys and Beacons. Hon. Mr. TESSIER objected to those provisions which transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries the power to direct the construction of all lighthouses, lightships, etc. Hon. Mr. MITCHELL informed the House that he had decided to modify the clauses objected to. A discussion then arose as to whether the Trinity House of the Province of Quebec had power to erect lighthouses, etc. Hon. Mr. MITCHELL at some length explained the scope and object of the bill, contending that the works could be more economically constructed under his department than under that of the Public Works.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, March 9.—Mr. JONES gave notice of a bill to alter the management of the Intercolonial Railway. He proposed that the railway should be placed in the hands of the Government. Mr. WALSH denied the charges of mismanage-

ment, and said that a return would be brought down in a few days which would show the whole position of the management. The bill was read a first time. A bill introduced by Mr. HARRISON, amending section 71 of the Act relating to the duties of Justices of the Peace out of Sessions, was also read a first time. Mr. BROWN asked if it was the intention of the Government to accede to the views of the Board of Agriculture of the Province of Quebec by abolishing postal charges on agricultural journals published in the Dominion as well as in Europe. Sir JONAS A. MACDONALD said that in this case the Government had not the power of remitting the postage and did not intend to invite legislation on the subject. Mr. COFFIN moved an address for correspondence relating to the depredations committed by American fishermen in Canadian waters. It was necessary to know whether we were to have efficient protection from the British Government in this matter. Mr. ROUBILLAC complained that although the Government had promised to make arrangements for having two or three vessels of the Royal Navy to protect our fisheries, these vessels had not protected the fisheries, at any rate in the Bay of Chaleurs, nor had the schooner "La Canadienne." Depredations had been made along the Canadian shore in that vicinity, and upon complaints being made to the Government of the matter, they had replied that it was the business of the local authorities. Sir JONAS A. MACDONALD replied that the answer was that the steamer of the Royal Navy was not employed to protect the Bay of Chaleurs alone, but the whole Canadian fisheries. The Government could not control the movements of the steamers of the Royal Navy. The Canadian Government were taking all possible steps to protect the fisheries. Sir A. T. GALT looked upon this as the most serious question that could engage the attention of the House, involving consequences of the greatest importance to the well-being of Canada and the mother-country, as well as of the United States. He deprecated discussion in the absence of the correspondence. Mr. ANGUS corroborated Mr. ROUBILLAC's statements as to the depredations in the Bay of Chaleurs. Hon. Mr. TURRILL attacked Sir A. T. GALT's position. He denied that the country was unable to protect its own rights, and protested against the conduct of those who, by making such assertions, invited the depredations of our neighbours. Mr. BARRAZZ thought it was very unjust of the Government to oblige the Local Legislatures to protect their own fishermen. Mr. FORBES was glad to hear the Government announce the policy of refusing licences to foreign fishermen. He thought that our fishermen could only be properly protected by police vessels, manned by our men accustomed to the work, stationed along the coast. Hon. Mr. HENNINGTON urged caution in the matter. Hon. Mr. HOWE admitted the necessity of caution, but contended that our right to protect our own fishermen was undoubted. The motion was passed. Mr. MILLS moved the second reading of the Bill to prevent some members from holding seats in Local Legislatures and the Dominion Parliament, repeating his former arguments in favour of the measure. Mr. HARRISON moved the six month's hoist. Hon. Mr. WOOD replied to the attacks of the member for Bothwell; he contended that members holding seats in both Legislatures were just as independent as those holding only one, and denied that any arrangement had been made between the members of the Ontario Government and the Dominion Government, whereby the former were pledged to support the latter. He maintained that the old party differences were all swept away by confederation, and condemned the attempts made to divide men into Tories and Reformers on old party issues. Mr. BEATY was opposed to the bill because it restricted the rights and privileges of electors. Mr. CHAMBERLAIN had after three years' experience somewhat modified his views on the subject of dual representation, but he believed the people themselves were the best judges on the question. Sir A. T. GALT did not wish to see the people restricted as to the choice of a representative. He thought, however, that members of a Local Government should be disqualified from sitting in the Dominion Parliament, and that also the local legislatures should disqualify members of the Dominion Government from sitting in their House. After further debate, the amendment was carried on division.—82 against 69.

Thursday, March 10.—Mr. MACKENZIE called attention to the publication in the Toronto *Leader* of a portion of the Red River correspondence. Sir JONAS A. MACDONALD thought that perhaps the writer of the papers in question had furnished them to the press. He intended to enquire into the matter. Sir A. T. GALT suggested that in the meantime the special committee to whom the papers were referred, be held responsible for the breach of privilege. Sir JONAS A. MACDONALD, seconded by Mr. MACKENZIE, moved that the special committee be revived and enquire into the improper publication of the papers.—Carried. Sir JONAS A. MACDONALD then moved the second reading of the Election Bill, providing for the assimilation of the election laws throughout the Dominion, fixing the qualifications of voters, and restricting the duration of elections to one day. Mr. BLAKE would not oppose the second reading of the bill, as it would be open to closer consideration at a later stage. He criticised the provisions of the bill as not sufficiently liberal. Mr. HARRISON replied to the arguments of Mr. BLAKE. Such alterations as were yet required to perfect the bill could be made in committee. He approved of the measure proposed as securing uniformity in election laws throughout the Dominion, and as being as little expensive as possible. Hon. Mr. ANNATT objected to the different qualifications between voters in towns incorporated and villages. Hon. Mr. DONOS thought that there should be no difference of qualification between town and country. He approved of the provision of the bill extending the franchise to those who had incomes of \$400, but objected to the present system of preparing the lists as cumbersome and expensive. He was glad to see that the voting was to take place on one day. Mr. COLBY objected to the bill in that it took away the vote of occupiers who had no legal title, but who were assessed and voted at present. He also objected to giving votes to officers of the customs and excise. Hon. Mr. ANGUS said that the bill as it stood at present deprived considerable numbers in New Brunswick of their vote. He objected to granting the franchise to official persons unless the ballot were given also. If the ballot system were adopted, he believed it would prove a strong preventive against bribery and intimidation, and if an amendment were proposed in that direction he would vote for it. The debate was then adjourned.

Friday, March 11.—The House was engaged for a considerable time with closed doors discussing a question of privilege. Sir FRANCIS HICKS then moved the House again into committee on the Banking Resolutions. He wished to go back to the 4th clause, which had already been passed, in order to insert two or three words, but to this objection was raised by Hon. Mr. HOLTON. Complaints were made by several members that