

for Congress. The tendency in Canada is precisely the same, and, so far as we can judge, the instances are rare in which individuals who have left the Reform party, owing to their preference for the protective policy of the Conservatives, have continued to support their old leaders in the Provincial elections. We are inclined to think that this is precisely what might be expected as the result of party organization.

It is now rather more than three years since a venerable statesman of great experience, Earl Grey, contributed to the *Nineteenth Century* a paper entitled, "How shall we retain the Colonies?" The occasion for writing this paper was the adoption by Canada of the principle of protection, and it led to another contribution from Lord Norton entitled, "How not to retain the Colonies," in which Lord Grey's views were combated with considerable ability. There is much in the respective papers that is applicable to the questions which force themselves on our consideration in Canada, and which may be designated, "How shall we preserve Confederation?" and "How not to preserve Confederation." It must be borne in mind that when in public life, and Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Grey was not surpassed in liberality by any statesman of his time. His views as to Imperial control may be gathered from a short passage in his paper:

"If the Colonies and the United Kingdom are to form an Empire in the true sense of the word, there must be some one paramount authority invested with sufficient power over all the separate communities that form the Empire to ensure that on matters that concern them all they shall not follow different and conflicting lines of conduct, but shall co-operate with each other. Every Colony enjoying representative institutions may fairly claim the right of taking such measures as it may judge to be best, whenever these affect only its own separate interests, but unless all the Colonies act in concert, and in subordination to the Imperial authority in everything that concerns the general interest, they cannot be said to constitute a real Empire."

It will be observed that Lord Grey, while contending that as regards questions affecting all parts of the Empire there ought to be one paramount authority, so as to secure unity of action, fully admits that in cases where there are separate interests the controlling power should rest with the subordinate authority. As regards the question of what we may term "Canadian Home Rule" there can be no doubt that the principle laid down by Lord Grey requires non-interference on the part of the Dominion Government with questions with which the Provincial Legislatures are authorized to deal. In the

States of the American Union instances are constantly occurring of State Legislatures being in antagonism to Congress, but their legislation, so long as it does not exceed their constitutional power, cannot be interfered with by any authority emanating from Congress. The power given to the Governor General to disallow the acts of the local Legislature is analogous to that which the Queen possesses to disallow the Acts of the Canadian Parliament, a power which, if exercised, even on such questions as those in which the whole Empire is interested, would create, and in our opinion justly create, intense dissatisfaction throughout the Dominion. We should fail to convey a just idea of Lord Grey's views if we were to omit noticing the remedy which he suggested to prevent uncalled for interference by the Imperial Government with local legislation. He strongly objected to the project which has been often recommended of Colonial representation in Parliament. He pointed out that it would be a very small proportion of the whole business of the House of Commons in which the Colonies would have any interest, and that it would be unreasonable that a Canadian or Australian member should have the right to speak and vote on questions relating to the imposition of taxes in Great Britain which his constituents would not have to pay. He likewise held that there would be an obvious inconvenience in having Colonial members sitting in Parliament, as this would lead to their being enrolled in the ranks of one or other of the parliamentary parties. If, he said, they adhered to the Opposition, it would be impossible for them to hold confidential intercourse with the Government, and if they supported the Ministers of the day, the defeat of the Administration would render their relations with a new one still more difficult. How, then, was the difficulty to be met? Admitting that almost any plan was liable to objections, Lord Grey suggested the formation of a committee of the Privy Council, to which Her Majesty might signify her readiness to appoint resident colonial agents, and which other members of the Privy Council in England, including the Secretary of State, might be specially instructed to attend. No colonial acts should be disallowed without having been first considered and reported on by this committee. Lord Grey, being a strong Free-trader is impressed with the conviction that the colonies can only be retained by preventing them from imposing protective duties, and the object of his proposed committee was to find a means of thwarting the views of the Canadian

Parliament. Although we are unable to concur either in Lord Grey's opinion as to the impending danger or as to the remedy which he has suggested, we venture to think that the latter is less objectionable than the exercise of an arbitrary veto.

Lord Norton in his reply deals with the expediency or practicability of increased control, and the probable results of attempting it. He said:

"There is no dispute as to the entire control which all such British communities have over matters of their own internal and local concern. The Imperial Parliament would never think of interference in exclusively colonial legislation, nor could the Sovereign constitutionally withhold the Royal assent from responsible Ministers, possessing the confidence of the Parliament passing such measures. The legislative authority of the Imperial Parliament is in theory transcendent, and extends over colonies and all dominions of the Sovereign; but in colonies under government responsible to their own representative legislatures it is practically never directly exerted at all. If it were it would reduce constitutional Government, recognized and established in a colony, to a fiction, sham, and delusion, fraught with mischief alike to the bastard colony and to the Mother Country so degrading herself abroad."

There is not one word in the foregoing extract that does not apply to our Provincial legislation. Ontario enjoys a representative assembly, and a responsible Ministry, and is not in the exceptional position of the Dominion Parliament, as its legislation cannot affect the people in other Provinces of the Dominion, who, nevertheless, through the instrumentality of a Government, responsible to their representatives, undertakes to disallow the acts of the Ontario Legislature, even when re-affirmed after a previous disallowance. The position of this question is well deserving of calm consideration. The people of Ontario will, ere long, be called on to pass their verdict, and it is confidently maintained that it will be in favor of the exercise of the veto. Should it be so it will perhaps remind Sir John Macdonald of the time when Lord Metcalfe succeeded in getting a Parliament elected, apparently in opposition to Responsible Government, as Sir Francis Head had likewise succeeded in doing some years previously. Those elections only proved that the political leaders who were successful were more popular at the moment than those whom they defeated. Those leaders would have been quite as indignant as their predecessors had the Government refused to follow their advice, and most assuredly if Mr. Meredith should succeed in defeating the present Ontario Government he would object as strongly as Mr. Mowat to his measures being