

But let me not drift into sentiment. It is well sometimes to have the soul stirred up a bit, and these reflections were the wholesome results of a first day's fishing. Amid these happy dreams the boat glided along, and soon we were at the landing-place. With an appetite not etherealized by the beauties and glories of the scene we were soon partaking of a substantial dinner. Not, indeed, a formal affair, with courses of dainties designed to tempt a cloyed appetite, but a toothsome collection of substantials, fresh bass caught by our own hand, served hot and sweetened by that most effective of sauces—a healthy appetite, born of outdoor exercise, freedom from care and the uplifting influences of nature. This, indeed, was living! This was getting out of one's self—out of the ruts of monotonous routine and restoring tone to body and mind.

After dinner how delightful the pipe tasted as we again seated ourselves on the verandah to enliven an hour with tale and gossip, and how soon, nature having free scope to assert herself, we felt a sweet drowsiness which told us that bed was the place for us all—not after midnight and with nightcaps and other noxious inventions, but early in the evening, the system all aglow with health. We arranged for another tour at half-past five next morning, and soon we were all in bed, and with a delightful sense of healthy exhaustion the world and consciousness began to fade out of sight.

That sleep was undisturbed by restless dreams; but in the balmy slumbers of the night came to me pleasant sensations of a tug at the line. In visions I was holding the rod once more, and felt what the fishermen so long for and starts with delight in finding—the rapturous tug at the hook which indicates a bite, and, in many cases a capture. Here was the enthusiast of a day completely carried away with the sport, and continuing the happy exercise in dreams. But what sportsman who has whipped a stream all day for salmon and been rewarded by landing a thirty-pounder before the day was over, has not gone over the exciting scenes in the silent watches of the night? It was as the scarred veteran of a hundred fights recalls the stirring incidents of some infantry charge when the enemy's stronghold was stormed, and the old flag was planted on the deserted battlements of the foe amid the battle's roar and his comrades' cheers.

Day after day passed, each filled with a quota of sport and pleasure. My exceptional luck continued, and though the party was increased by fresh arrivals I still remained each day *facile princeps*—the new meteor in the piscatorial heavens. The longer I remained the more indifferent I became to all that was occurring in the outer world. Rest and renewed health were the guerdons of each day's experience. But all things must come to an end, and the time necessarily arrived when I was to take my last look at Rideau Lake and go back to newspapers, letters, telegrams and business. Thus endeth the story of my first—but I hope not last—fishing expedition, which had been postponed by the accidents of fate for forty years. Once more I am in the old routine, but with renewed vigour and energy. The prosaic now surrounds and prevails. But amid the din of duty it is pleasant to go back to such scenes as I have been describing. They brighten up one's life, and some other unfortunate old boy who like myself has not indulged in sport, because it was undignified, may be roused from his lethargy while reading these pages and become what I now am, an enthusiastic, though I hope a sensible sportsman.—*Hon. J. W. Longley, in Outing.*

#### HOW BRITISH COLONIES GOT RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.

THE British Colonies which live under responsible government resting on a broad democratic franchise have been engaged for a generation and upwards in an experiment on which the United Kingdom is just entering, the experiment of disciplining these independent forces, and accustoming them for the first time to work harmoniously together. The Colonies have already solved, or tried and failed to solve, some of the problems which just now perplex statesmen at home. Free Education, the Eight Hours' System, Local Option (with or without compensation), and the One Man One Vote principle have been dealt with; some of them in a manner to amaze persons who only know democracy by the bookish theoretic. Shorter parliaments, payment of members and elective expenses, borne not by the candidates but by the State, which are already debated as necessary reforms in England, have also been tried in Australia, with more or less success.

The experience of men of the same race and education, though they happen to live in Ottawa or Melbourne, and not in Westminster, may not be without value. It will sometimes prove a persuasive example, sometimes a significant warning—for the experiment of responsible government based on a broad democracy, though singularly successful on the whole, has not escaped grave mistakes, and even serious sins against public liberty.

There is a livelier and perhaps a more intelligent interest taken in colonial affairs of late, and a few students have mastered them as sympathetically as Burke and Sheridan mastered the obscure Indian problem a hundred years ago, but I do not believe our patron, the reading public, has got much beyond the general conclusion that there are prosperous British settlements scattered over the world which they and their predecessors, by liberal expenditure and wise guidance, as they make no doubt, were good enough to establish and maintain. If an inquirer desires to know a little more, he is met on the threshold by the

difficulty that he has to grope in the dark for the history of obscure transactions, and does not know where to begin. But as the relation of colonies to the mother country must be put on a new footing if they are to be permanent, it will not be amiss to understand a little of their past relations.

I have been repeatedly invited to describe the experiment in Australia. I shrank from the task because I must speak of transactions to which I was a party, and I cannot be free from prepossessions. But as I lived nearly a quarter of a century in one of the great colonies where responsible government was initiated and developed, and, from the necessity of my position there, was a student of colonial history in general, the subject is at least not new to me. To this fourth appeal I have answered that as some one must begin I will do my best. I propose to tell, without unnecessary detail, how these distant possessions came to obtain English liberty, for this is an essential preface if the later story of colonial progress would be understood. Next, at convenient intervals, to tell what use they made of it; and finally, how far their experience may be serviceable to this country since it has adopted the same democratic franchise.

There are British colonies in Africa, America and Australia, inhabited by more than ten millions of the same birth or blood as the population of the United Kingdom, controlling a territory many times larger than Europe, who are now living under Parliamentary government. This system, as it exists in colonies, was like English liberty itself, the result of cautious experiments, and of concessions tardily made to public necessity or public danger. No great statesman at home, pondering over the interests of his troubled dependencies, proposed to tranquillise the hereditary institutions of England from the Imperial to the Colonial community. No colonist of super-colonial growth distinctly claimed this concession as of right from the beginning. In the history of human perversity, indeed, there is scarcely a chapter more marvellous, more grotesque, or more humiliating than the story how British Colonies obtained the liberty which they enjoy.

Down to the reign of George III., the doctrine prevailed on all sides that colonies existed for the benefit not of the colonists, but of the mother country. Statesmen, who were good enough to insist that they ought to be permitted to enjoy certain municipal liberties, were careful to declare that they were not entitled to employ them for the purpose of competing in any industry in which England was engaged. Spain had forbidden her subjects in Mexico, and France had forbidden her subjects in Louisiana, to plant the vine lest they should presume to make wine and interfere with the trade at home; and when some audacious colonists planted the forbidden fruit, it was immediately rooted out—and in the same maternal spirit England interdicted manufacturing enterprise in all her colonies.

Even the employment of their own funds was a luxury denied to colonists, except when distinctly acknowledged as a favour. The House of Commons, in the year 1755, declared that "the claim of right in a colonial Assembly to raise and apply public money by its own act alone is derogatory to the Crown, and to the rights of the people of Great Britain." This declaration was intended to bear fruits, and it bore some memorable ones. Nine years later the House of Commons without a dissentient voice agreed to impose a tax on the colonists of North America towards meeting the public expenditure of the Empire—that Empire which had fostered them in so singular a manner. These colonies habitually paid the cost of their civil government and of their military defence, and had quite recently aided the mother country in a protracted war with France. They declared themselves, however, willing to grant further aid provided it was granted through their own Legislature, but they denied the right of the Parliament of England to impose any tax on them. The English lawyers (says Bancroft) all maintained the right of England to tax her own colonies. It is worth remembering as an eternal lesson not to be deterred from asserting a clear right by the authority of names—it is a fact which might even disturb the supreme self-confidence of Sir James Stephen on the problems of imperial policy—that at the time this doctrine was insisted on English lawyers had Lord Mansfield at their head in one House of Parliament, and Blackstone in the other. The statesmen, who were more liberal than the lawyers, held a doctrine which will seem as insensate in our day. Lord Chatham insisted that colonists could not be taxed without their consent, but he was ready to admit that they had no right to fabricate a spade or a pickaxe without authority from the Alma Mater. The philosophers were naturally more unreasonable and wrong-headed than the statesmen. Samuel Johnson, whom Carlyle asks us to accept (very much against our will) as the foremost man then living in the island of Britain, reminded the appealing colonists that they were a race of convicts who ought to be thankful for any treatment short of hanging. Junius, the champion of popular rights in England, scoffed at their claims to self-government, and the newspapers assailed them with ferocious scorn for assuming to assert that they had any rights contrary to the interest and convenience of the mother country—an amiable theory of international rights, which some of us have reason to believe is not quite extinct at present. Ingratitude was the sin of colonists it seems; they had forgotten the State which made and maintained them. Colonel Barré, a distinguished Irish soldier, who after serving with Wolfe in Canada, now occupied a seat in the House of Commons, told that assembly his mind on this subject, in terms which are, perhaps, not yet quite out of date.

"They planted by your care!" he exclaimed. "No, your oppression planted them in America. They nourished by your intelligence! They grew by your neglect of them. They protected by your arms! They have nobly taken up arms in your defence, have exerted a valour amidst their constant and laborious industry for the defence of a country whose frontier was drenched in blood, while its interior parts yielded all its savings to your emolument. And, believe me, remember, I this day tell you so, the same spirit of freedom which actuated that people at first will accompany them still. But prudence forbids me to explain myself further."

The narrative now passes to Canada. The province of Quebec, as it was then named, had distinguished itself in the American war, by fidelity to the British Crown. Though its population was almost exclusively French by birth or descent, the territory having been ceded by France to England so recently as 1763, the Canadians refused the solicitations of the colonies in arms to unite with them in declaring their independence. Congress sent the American Ulysses, Benjamin Franklin and a popular Catholic bishop, on a mission to Quebec, but their seductive counsels proved vain, and the French Canadians, not content with neutrality, took up arms for England. When the war was over a large body of English loyalists left the United States and settled in the division of Canada, afterwards known as the Upper Province, rather than violate their allegiance by becoming citizens of the new Republic.

How these faithful subjects were cherished, how they were recompensed for their fidelity, how far the Magna Charta of the colonies barred their local rights against invasion, are themes as fruitful as a student of colonial interests can study. For a dozen years or so nothing was done for the rights of Canadians, but when France first became a Republic, and a war between England and the new democracy was imminent, the younger Pitt bestowed a constitution on the colony with great precipitation. The territory was divided into two Provinces—Lower Canada occupied by the French population, and Upper Canada colonized chiefly by the immigrant English loyalists. The Provinces were to be governed respectively by a Legislative Council nominated by the Crown, a Legislative Assembly elected by the people, and a Governor to represent the Sovereign, assisted by an Executive Council, chosen at his discretion. These gallant and faithful communities one might suppose would be *enfants gâtés* of the mother country, but the mother country preferred the discipline of Solomon, and did not spare the rod. The form of free institutions alone was established. The representatives of the people had no control over the public revenue, nor the slightest influence over the policy and patronage of the Governor and his Council. One considerable source of revenue arose from duties on trade. The Magna Charta of the colonies, as we know, provided that such duties should be spent on the colony, and by the authority of the colony; but on the pettifogging plea that the Act imposing these particular duties was passed four years before the Colonial Magna Charta, the money was expended under the direction of the Lords of the Treasury in London, and continued to be so expended in these loyal colonies for more than half a century after the right had been renounced in favour of colonies in arms. It is a rule of law that beneficial statutes extend to things not *in esse* at the time they were enacted, but the rule of law was not considered operative in colonies. If the history of human error and perversity ever comes to be written, it will hardly contain a more significant incident than this. But it had its use; the second important step in colonial liberty was gained through the contests which it naturally provoked.

The Legislative Assembly in Lower Canada was quiescent and submissive at first, but it soon came to comprehend in some degree its rights. It found itself opposed, however, by an Upper Chamber consisting of officials imported from England, and nominated for life, and whom every Governor supported, and who were in possession of all real power in the colony. The first demand for control over the public purse was met by the outraged Governor as Strafford might have met it in Ireland, by sending the leaders of the opposition to gaol. There was an annual deficit in the colonial Exchequer however, and as it had to be made up by a grant from England, the offer of the Legislative Assembly to supply the deficit by a colonial tax was a bait too tempting to be resisted, and they were permitted to buy a fragment of their rights, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, as a trading community in the Middle Ages might have bought it from a robber baron, at a fixed ransom. The concession made was that they were permitted to vote the supplies. But the official gentlemen in the Executive Council thought the most respectful and convenient manner in which they could proceed would be to vote them for a series of years together, according to the ancient and approved practice in England: that is to say, the practice under the Stuarts before the Revolution. At length it was conceded that they might be voted annually, but only in a lump sum for the service of the year, leaving the Governor and the official gentlemen aforesaid to distribute the money at their discretion.

In the contest which ensued, the Governor invariably agreed with the Upper House, and the Colonial Office commonly agreed with the Governor. The Canadians, however, had come to understand their rights, and persisted in demanding them; gaining a little from time to time by judicious pressure. They limited themselves so strictly