

still unable to stand alone; and will seek rather to promote its trade, than its Empire. Englishmen believe that we are able to fulfil all these conditions and they are cautiously but persistently pressing the responsibility upon us. Need we hesitate to take the hint and prepare to assume it? Are our public men too timid to lead the people up to the great work which is before them? Are they blind to the signs of the times or are they seeking to encourage the people in blindness? It is, time that every Canadian should comprehend the attitude which England is assuming; and that he should calmly and dispassionately admit there is method in the madness she is accused of. We have seen that in a commercial sense or in a sense of military or national *prestige*, she derives no advantage from the connection. We have seen, that there is mutual disadvantage—unmistakable danger to the mother and the child, in the relations subsisting between them. How long ought we to hesitate and temporize? How long can we afford to cultivate blindness to our true position, and go on simulating an importance which is deceitful and visionary. The change must come and it is only manful to prepare for it. It is childish to underrate ourselves or the duties that await us. There are dangers in delay and it is our duty to face the grave aspect of the position. As we have seen, the interest and the policy of the Imperial Government are unmistakable. Tory and Radical seem for once in accord. No doubt the responsibility of ministers in England, the delicacies of party relations, the anxiety of one side to retain office and of the other side to obtain it, may temper imperial tactics and stimulate caution and reserve. It may be that even yet a skilful appeal to the dead past of the old colonial policy might rouse a spirit of resistance among the British masses. There may be some who still believe that the perpetual minority of the Colonies is essential to the glory of the Empire: as there are still some who cherish the traditional faith that one Englishman can whip two Frenchmen. This state of things may delay, but it cannot avert the crisis. There remains still the Colonial Policy—the unmistakable hand writing on the wall. Even Sir John Young our chief Imperial officer, an able, astute, and experienced statesman, has not found it consistent with his high duties to be reticent upon this great question of the hour. Cautiously of course, as became his high office, but significantly as the representative of great Imperial interests here, he hints at the transition State, through which our Institutions are passing. He stated at Quebec and reiterated at Halifax, that Canadian statesmen and people are the best judges of their own interests; that their destinies were in their own hands and that if they decided upon some change, the proposition would re-

ceive from the statesmen and people of England, a generous and friendly consideration. His Excellency does not belong to that school of thinkers, who, precluding the great consolidation here, further changes are not to be thought of. He does not tell us that, because Confederation is but half accomplished, we should shut our eyes to the future, and leave blind chance to accomplish the destinies of this Great Northern Dominion. He tells us indeed, in his Halifax speech, that he had been misrepresented at Quebec and that he had been made to talk of change of allegiance, when he only meant change of alliance. Nobody but the wilfully blind could have understood His Excellency otherwise. Nobody could have dreamed that a British Governor, would suggest to the people of half a continent under his rule, the cession of their territory to a foreign power. But His Excellency is too good a philosopher not to understand the full purport of the words he discusses. Allegiance signifies the obligation of a subject to his Prince or Government—Alliance suggests original powers mutually exercised by the parties to a compact, and practically, therefore, allegiance ceases when alliance begins, and this view is quite consistent with Sir John Young's able speeches, as interpreted by himself. He simply did not intend to convey the idea that England would promote the annexation of this great country to the vast territories of our Republican neighbours, while at the same time he felt that the future had something nobler in store for us than the mere Colonial tutelage of our times. Hence he spoke of change from such a state; encouraged us, by reciting the example of Holland, with smaller territory and fewer resources; and cheered us with the promise of the perpetual good will of his Government and "alliance" with England the "mother of nations." The country owes a debt of gratitude to His Excellency, for this timely aid to the popular thought, for thus cautiously foreshadowing that brilliant future, whose effulgence has dazzled his timid ministers. It is moreover stated, upon what seems to be undoubted authority, that when it was first intimated to Sir A. T. Galt, that Her Majesty had it in contemplation, in view of his distinguished public services, to confer upon him the honour of knighthood, that gentleman took occasion to lay before the Executive, a statement, expressing his high sense of this great honour, but that he felt, he ought, before accepting it, to represent the strong views he entertained in favour of the early independence of this country. But Her Majesty's representative, found in this phase of opinion, no disqualification for Royal favour, and Her Majesty was graciously pleased to confer it. It would be fair to ask if Sir John Young did not mean to indicate independence, what did he mean? He could not have referred to