

amined in all its branches, and a demonstration given of the benefits, political, social, and commercial, of colonial establishments, which detailed proofs that their cost falls far short of their benefits, and that the wars ascribed to them had another origin. The book was very soon out of print, and I have always refused to allow a second edition. It might now, however, be of some use, as the information contained respecting the colonies of all nations ought to be more generally diffused. The lapse of 60 years have no doubt made great changes, and the work is to be viewed as historical with regard to the facts; but the doctrines have been confirmed by all that has happened; they are entirely applicable to the present state of affairs, and are most worthy of attention from the promoters of social science. Sixty years! ay, indeed, great indeed have been the changes which in that time have visited our race—changes which all dominions, principalities, and Powers have undergone. The destroying angel has stalked abroad in the Old World and in the New, snapping the ties that bound States and their provinces together, extinguishing old monarchies and calling into existence new, hurling mighty Sovereigns from their thrones and replacing them with humble and unknown, making revolutions and changes of dynasty no longer events that startle by their rare occurrence and terrific aspects, but to be expected in the ordinary course of affairs, and as things to which habit has reconciled us. Notwithstanding these mighty changes, all that relates to colonial policy must ever remain in this country an important subject and a practical, as long as—to use the picturesque language of Lord Erskine in his noblest oration—“the restless foot of English adventure is unceasingly encroaching on so many deserts; and the tried virtue of English character is converting them into flourishing abodes of civilized life.” So rapid has been our colonial progress, that with our Australian settlement commercial intercourse has increased ten-fold in as many years; and our duty as well as our interest is so to govern it that its inevitable independence may become only a fresh ground of gratitude, of a lasting and a hearty friendship. The origin of a colony, the similarity of character and habits, the identity of language, will always make the connexion natural if the separation be effected peaceably and amicably; and what in commercial dealings may be the changes from accidental circumstances, the tendency of emigration will always be steadily in this direction.”

4. BRITISH AND AMERICAN LIBERTY COMPARED.

Governor Seymour, of New York, made a great speech at Syracuse the other day. In the course of an argument upon the tyrannical encroachments of the Federal Government, he made the following handsome acknowledgment of the true spirit of liberty that exists upon British institutions:—“The proudest Government that exists upon the face of the earth is that of Great Britain, and its proudest statesman, when he would tell of Britain’s crowning glory, did not speak of its wide spread dominions, upon which the sun never sets, did not say, as he might have done, that the beat of its morning drum made a continuous strain of music round the world. He did not speak of martial achievements, of glorious battle fields, and of splendid naval conflicts; but he said, with swelling breast, and kindling eye, that the poorest man of Great Britain in his cottage might bid defiance to all the forces of the crown. It might be frail, its roof might shake, the wind might blow through it, the storm might enter, the rain might enter; but the King of England could not enter it. All his powers did not dare to cross the threshold of that ruined tenement.* (Great cheering.)”

5. REV. H. W. BEECHER ON ENGLISH MONARCHY.

At Liverpool Mr. Beecher said:—“Did I live, had I been born and bred, in England, I think there is no question that I should feel as you feel, for I say that in no other land that I know of under the sun are a monarchy and an aristocracy holding power under it, standing armed as the bulwark of the throne—in not another land so many popular benefits accruing under the government; and if you must have an aristocracy, where in any other land can you point to men so politically, but more noble by disposition, by culture, by manliness, and true Christian piety. (Applause.) I believe that monarchy and aristocracy, as they are practically developed in England, are abundantly consistent with the great doctrine of government as being for the benefit of the governed.”

6. THE AMERICAN AND BRITISH TYPES OF GOVERNMENT.

In a late lecture on this subject in Toronto the Honourable T. D. McGee spoke as follows:—I have considered the problem of American example at its source, and it is one I do not feel disposed to

commend to my countrymen of Canada. For me it has the fatal defect of instability and inconstancy. (Applause.) It may be that, out of their present tribulation, the national character will consolidate and establish itself; but up to the present, whether in manners or in ideas there has not been that fixity of character, in the republic which—even supposing every thing there to be for the best—would justify any observer in proposing it as a model to other communities. The colony-bred men who founded the republic, were men with English ideas of law and Government. George Washington was quite as ceremonious in his official conduct as George III. He drove to open the first Congress with “buff and blue” liveries—postillions and foot-men; and in his carriage towards ambassadors and private citizens, he preserved all the gravity and dignity of a sovereign. As to the judicial office, from the highest to the lowest—from the decisions of the supreme court to the pettiest jurisdictions—the Americans of to-day have departed much farther from the ideas of their grandfathers than we in Canada have, from the English of the age of Alfred. In the legislative department of the government, new opinions, no less opposed to the old colonial wisdom have prevailed. The founders of the American system of government were statesmen who had the sagacity to see that it was essential to the stability of their new creation to combine in it the two great principles of liberty and authority. They therefore sought to lodge the principle of authority or inviolability somewhere. They had too recently suffered from the arbitrary exercise of the kingly power to place that principle in the person or office of the president. They therefore erected a tribune of twelve judges, who should hold office for life, and from whose interpretation of the constitution or from whose decision as between individual states and the general government or as between private parties and each state, there was to be no appeal. Now that tribune has been virtually superseded by the President, and the principle of imperial authority or inviolability is gone—probably for ever. What the end will be is a problem of the future. As to the other original of a free state, the British Constitution, it at least, will be allowed, even by its enemies, the merit of stability. As it exists to-day, it has existed for eight hundred—for a thousand years. (Applause.) I take the British constitutional system as the great original system upon which are founded the institutions of all free states. I take it as one of a family born of Christian civilization, and of the religion of that Germanic empire which breaking up transmitted it to other empires to mould for them free institutions. I take it as combining in itself, permanency and liberty—liberty in its best form, not in theory alone, but in practice—liberty which is enjoyed in practice by all the people of Canada of every origin and creed. (Applause.) Can any one pretend to say that a chapter of accidents which we can trace for eight hundred years, and which some antiquarians may even trace for a much longer period, will account for the permanence of these institutions? If you say that they have not in themselves the elements of permanency—if they have not the saving salt which preserves the formation of the government of a free state from one generation to another—how do you account for their continued and prosperous existence—how do you account for it that of all the ancient constitutions of Europe this alone remains; and remains not only with all its ancient outlines, but with great modern improvements and even alterations, but alterations made in harmony with the design of the first architects? (Applause.) Here is a form of government that has lasted with modifications to suit the spirit of the age for a period of 800 years; and here is another that has lasted 80 years, if it may not now be said to be disrupted by the exigencies of the present civil war. One has had a career of eight centuries, and the other of two-and-a-half generations. How is it that I account for the permanency of the institutions of the first? Because, in the first place, their outline plan whatever abuse or injustice may have been the occasional result of the system, they combine all that has ever been discovered in the science of government of material importance. The wisdom of the middle age and the present, political writers and those of a late day, have all laid down one maxim of government—that no unmixed form of government can satisfy the wants of a free and intelligent people, that an unmixed democracy for instance must result in anarchy or military despotism; but that form of government which combines in itself an inviolable monarchy and popular representation, with the incitements and inducements of an aristocracy—a working aristocracy, an aristocracy that took its share in the day of battle, and of toil and labor, of care and anxiety in the time of peace; an aristocracy of talent open to the people who by talent and labor made themselves worthy to enter it—was the highest problem of political science, the highest effort of the mind of man. (Applause.) Let us see if the British form, apart from any details of its practice, combines in itself these three qualities. If we hold that authority and liberty are necessary to free government—and one is as necessary as the other—then we can apply the touch-stone to this system and see whether it be true to the mechanism on which it stands. The leading principles of the British system is that the head of the state

* The great Pitt first gave utterance to this noble tribute to the inviolability of personal liberty in England.