

Extracts from late English Papers.

PERILOUS POSITION OF THE CANADAS.

THE TIMES NEW-PAPER USED BY THE IMBECILE BRITISH GOVERNMENT TO GET THEM RID OF COLONIES WHICH THEY FEEL THEMSELVES UNFIT TO MANAGE.

The Times has undertaken the defence of the Government of Lord Elgin; but in this case the London Standard is in vain, as no one listens. — Glasgow Standard, May 19, 1849.

To the Editor of the Glasgow Examiner. I hope sincerely that it will prove to be as you state in your editorial article of to-day (that no one would be the thunder of the Times), for if the colonies suppose the Times to be a true reflection of public opinion they will necessarily despise this country as the seat of all fixed principle, patriotism, moral, or political, and the opponents of the British Government in Ireland will have to contend with a harshness for which no reason is adduced except that in the crushed circumstances of the Irish people their feelings may be outraged with impunity; and to be against the supporters of British rule and honour in Canada seems to be quite as good a way of the Times as the mouth piece of an insatiable ambition which all must know the British population of North America will treat with the ridicule and contempt it deserves, come from where it may.

The cruel injustice to Ireland, whose case called for the greatest consideration and deserved the greatest sympathy, found no echo in the public mind, and it were needless to say if it responded to the present clamour of the Times against the noble British population of Upper Canada, whose distinction it is to be "the noblest of Britain's offspring, because the best of Britain herself." The British public is just settling on the principle that "honesty is the best policy" will take the same view it did in 1837 of those who were on whom the British principle and monarchy depended as their defenders; and if prepared to institute a comparison between that portion of her Majesty's subjects whose loyalty has been most tried and proved, and those who have been the most tried and proved, it will be to acknowledge the truth that with both the rebels and the Irish rebels will at least be found more honest and true patriotism than the Whig Ministry and the newspaper tool can boast of. Let the charlatans and the scolders take courage by the experience of the Lower Canada rebels. They, too, will have (unless they are) the advocacy of the Times.

Treason never prospers! what's the reason? — Because when reason prospers 'tis not treason."

Of all the infamous acts of the Whigs never has any more disgraceful than their present attempt, without shadow of proof, to fasten the late outrages in Montreal on those whom they know well to be the only true friends of the British cause in Canada. The Whigs know that no other result of these Governmental proceedings, if persisted in, can reasonably be expected but that of driving the British population of Canada to lay bare their feelings and recount their grievances at the feet of the throne. But how is it, I may be asked by those less informed, that there is a majority in the Canadian Parliament for such an anti-British measure? I answer that the loyalists of Upper Canada have to contend against what is the greatest practical obstacle to their success, not being able to obtain a majority in the House of Commons. They are afraid to introduce a principle that might tend to subvert the present establishment at home, and so men tainted with the taint of 1837-38 were in numerous cases preferred to the late elections to loyalists, because the latter were not so much in the habit of being elected as those who had been rebels, but because the constituents were determined to rid Upper Canada of Church and Whig monopolies. At some time let it be remembered when the present majority got elected the Upper Canada constituencies were not to do that their pockets were to be packed to pay the Lower Canadian disloyalists conspirators of 1837, any more than has been intended by a proposal to indemnify Smith O'Brien and his associates. It is, however, a great mistake to suppose that legitimate parties in politics (characterised by the difference of their views as to the internal government of the colony) are yet formed or ever can be formed, while constitutional or church questions are left undecided to sow dissensions among the Anglo-Saxon race. Indeed, as respects the impossibility of at present forming a true British connection party, the position of the subjects in Canada are discriminated from the high ground (famously known as the Family Compact, or the Church and College faction), by the latter having received advantages which the former could not get, or could not take, just as the dissenters and loyal Roman Catholics of Ireland are not able conscientiously to unite with the Conservatives in Ireland to form an overwhelming majority party of loyalists, however much as individuals they are friends and admirers of each other.

It is the same in the denial of all the subjects' privileges to those who are prepared to do all the duties of the race. Parity of religious distinctions in fact are the cause, and the heart-burnings and party dissensions thereby are the proximate cause why the haters of the Whig rule in Canada were led to believe in 1837 in the possibility of successful rebellion, and why the same thing occurred in Ireland in 1848; and if church favouritism is to be continued no great British connection party will ever be formed either in Ireland or in Canada, and I do not see how it can be formed, and even the breaking up of the Whig party is not as certain as that off it will follow cause. In the days of revolution it will take a crown, and not a party, to govern the empire, yet the vital question here pointed out is the only thing against which the London Standard does not thunder. Is it for fear of church advertisements? or are the editors of Puseyites? or are they an endless job to undertake an exposure of all misrepresentations, wilfully or ignorantly, made by the Times, so I shall confine myself to those contained in the London Standard, articles of Thursday (17th).

Representations of the nature of the point at issue in Canada: False Representations of the feelings of the French in Canada; False Representations of the feelings and character of the British in Canada.

FALSE REPRESENTATIONS BY THE TIMES OF THE FEELINGS AND CHARACTER OF THE FRENCH IN CANADA.

I will yield to no man in my respect for and even admiration of the French Canadians, as individuals, nor would I blame, as unnatural or otherwise than as a thing impracticable, their unanimous aspirations at a "French Nationality;" but, as the province must either be French or English, and as it can never be made French now that the English settlers far outnumber the habitants, it seems to me to be the greatest injustice to ourselves, and a species of the most refined cruelty to them, not to make Canada, above board and at once, English in every thing public, giving the French all the English liberty and every advantage which we claim for ourselves, but putting a stop to the absurdity of their expecting to be Frenchmen, even if their prejudices may believe this to be better for them. But the Times recklessly asserts, "The rebels of 1837 were patriotic and honourable men compared with their present opponents. The former fought for free and equal institutions; the latter for the ascendancy of a faction or a race." I really blush to think that any English writer could so pervert the truth, and then turn it against his country. No one doubts that the Lower Canadians were patriots, but their patriotism was French, not English. No one doubts that they were so far honourable as to be conscientious in their rebellion and in their preference for French as contrasted with the English institutions. It was for the ascendancy of their race alone that they fought, and, for this they would fight against the British Government to-morrow if they saw any chance of success; but as for the assertion that they fought for free and equal institutions, there is scarcely the shadow of a foundation for it, as the English colonists enjoyed no advantage under the constitution of 1793 that the French Canadians did not. And what alone could give the least excuse for this bold assertion is, that Lord John Russell in 1835 had got the assent of the Imperial Parliament to a suspension of the said constitution of the colony, the French Parliament of Quebec having so grossly insulted the British authority (as the Whigs then thought), to prove Lower Canada unfit for British liberty, and incapable of British representative Government.

FALSE REPRESENTATIONS BY THE TIMES OF THE FEELINGS AND CHARACTER OF THE BRITISH IN CANADA.

The Times, in its ignorance, would laugh the British Parliament down. The British Parliament has not the least intention of putting its foot into the Canadian quagmire. It is not its intention, or to curtail the conduct of the Montreal Whigs, or of Sir Benjamin D'Urban, or any other individual, to offer it will probably find the subject at least interesting as the Rajah of Sarawak's claims." Now, I will tell you as any man either in or out of the province, that the Times would make it, that the British population of the part of the British Government than was the Tea Tax. The arbitrary mode of this Rebel Indemnity Bill is in no degree less (the money is to be equal to the money in its own right), while the object to which it is to be applied, is one to which honourable mention of their having been in 1837 engaged in a dishonest cause. Upper Canada will await with confidence the result of their appeal from the Whig Ministry to the

British throne; but never, be assured, will the British Canadians consent to be taxed to pay the French Canadians for their Rebellion, nor will they even agree to the Imperial Government doing so. In fact, the feelings of the Loyalists of Canada is just that which Thomas Jefferson expressed to John Randolph, 25th August, 1775. (Am. Archives.)

"I am sincerely one of those who still wish for reunion with the parent country, and would rather be dependent on Great Britain, properly limited, than on any nation upon earth, or than on no nation. But I am one of those, too, who rather than submit to the rights of legislation for us assumed by the British Parliament, and which late experience has shown they will so cruelly exercise, would lend my hand to sink the whole island in the ocean."

2nd. But this writes the bullying Times (its contorted facts being evidently derived from the oblique Secretary of the Colonies):—"To pass such a bill is no stretch of liberty, no insult to royal authority or law. It is merely the settlement of existing and admitted claims by a regular process of adjudication. The British public will not moot the question whether the Colonial Legislature had a right to pass such an act, or whether Lord Elgin might properly allow his Cabinet to introduce it, and so give it a species of sanction."

"Has Canada, moreover, abused the liberties we have lately guaranteed her, or has she exceeded their just and ample range. Most certainly not."

I must leave it to people of that peculiar mental formation which Lord George Bentinck used to remark to Lord Grey's school, to understand how it happens to be no degradation to loyalty to be made to eat the words it issued from his cannon's mouth (especially if these conveyed the meaning it intended and still professes to approve of), while all the time it is admitted that in common humanity, this would be an insult amounting to a loss of honour, and therefore greater than life is worth. But well assured I am that the British public is not so stupid as to be unable to distinguish between the mere organic power conferred by Britain on the Canadian Parliament, and its right or duty as a British institution. A man possesses the power to cut his throat, but it were irrational that he should do so merely to show his power; and so the Canadian Parliament has the power again to vote the Queen a nuisance, as the French Canadians did in 1837 and as they have now practically done by this Rebel Indemnity Bill, by which supporters of the crown in the day trial are punished for their devotion to cause of the British Government, a very plain way, as it appears to us, of repudiating royal authority in Canada.

FALSE REPRESENTATIONS BY THE TIMES OF THE FEELINGS AND CHARACTER OF THE FRENCH IN CANADA.

I will yield to no man in my respect for and even admiration of the French Canadians, as individuals, nor would I blame, as unnatural or otherwise than as a thing impracticable, their unanimous aspirations at a "French Nationality;" but, as the province must either be French or English, and as it can never be made French now that the English settlers far outnumber the habitants, it seems to me to be the greatest injustice to ourselves, and a species of the most refined cruelty to them, not to make Canada, above board and at once, English in every thing public, giving the French all the English liberty and every advantage which we claim for ourselves, but putting a stop to the absurdity of their expecting to be Frenchmen, even if their prejudices may believe this to be better for them. But the Times recklessly asserts, "The rebels of 1837 were patriotic and honourable men compared with their present opponents. The former fought for free and equal institutions; the latter for the ascendancy of a faction or a race." I really blush to think that any English writer could so pervert the truth, and then turn it against his country. No one doubts that the Lower Canadians were patriots, but their patriotism was French, not English. No one doubts that they were so far honourable as to be conscientious in their rebellion and in their preference for French as contrasted with the English institutions. It was for the ascendancy of their race alone that they fought, and, for this they would fight against the British Government to-morrow if they saw any chance of success; but as for the assertion that they fought for free and equal institutions, there is scarcely the shadow of a foundation for it, as the English colonists enjoyed no advantage under the constitution of 1793 that the French Canadians did not. And what alone could give the least excuse for this bold assertion is, that Lord John Russell in 1835 had got the assent of the Imperial Parliament to a suspension of the said constitution of the colony, the French Parliament of Quebec having so grossly insulted the British authority (as the Whigs then thought), to prove Lower Canada unfit for British liberty, and incapable of British representative Government.

FALSE REPRESENTATIONS BY THE TIMES OF THE FEELINGS AND CHARACTER OF THE BRITISH IN CANADA.

The British party is alleged to be "not only a vile but an insignificant oligarchy, no more in fact than the old 'family compact' and yet, small though it be, it is represented as overawing the councils of the province and frightening his Excellency out of his propriety, while, as *desperadoes*, its members are assumed as capable, if not guilty, of burning the Parliament House, &c., &c."

"In Canada the men who call themselves the British party, and who had hitherto relied on the Imperial support against the people of the colony had no idea of so peaceful and constitutional a method. They took up a hostile position to the House they had themselves called into existence, and the people who had returned it. Throughout the province, and particularly at Montreal, they made it the object of bitter denunciation and reckless menace."

"In truth, the pretensions of these Tory desperadoes are such as are utterly inadmissible to this country and this age. In the face of a solemn treaty by which Englishmen and Frenchmen, *Tros Terrisquis*, are bound to live in unity and equality, Sir Allan M'Nab and his accomplices are conspiring to disfranchise, enslave, and crush not far from a million of her Majesty's peaceable subjects."

"In Canada we behold an oligarchy, which has long revelled in the plunder of a province, labouring to overthrow a senate, to bully a Governor, to paralyse a majority, and to degrade a people, merely that they may again monopolise office and divide official booty."

Upon such rash and unsupported assertion the British public can never surely be duped by the Whigs into a belief that the British party and the family faction are convertible terms. If so and a mistake were committed, many an innocent, because ignorant, man would hereafter have to regret having assisted, by means of insult and injury, in converting a British Province into a State of the American Republic against its own will. The British public will not, however, believe that if the Whigs and the Times had to meet the British party as an armed force, they would trust to their being such a minority; for if so, how was the country saved to England in 1837, from the hostile and united grasp of Lord Elgin's friends and the American sympathisers? What is it the Tory desperadoes have done, except demanding, and by every means known to the constitution, in insisting that the constituents be appealed to before passing so unexpected and altogether so extraordinary an act as his Rebel Indemnity Bill? Where could have been their advantage in this if they have not the country behind them? As I have shown at some length above, the present Parliament is no indication of the strength of parties. For my part, had I been in Canada I would certainly have been found among those whose representatives are supporters of the Rebel Indemnity Bill. There was no constitutional question at stake, and the idea of an indemnity to the Lower Canadian rebels was never mooted at the general election, so I would certainly have voted (believing this the best British policy) for the men whom I thought ablest to root out of Upper Canada all exclusive church and college establishments; and thus of course I would have the mortification now to feel myself misrepresented on the subject of this most odious tax. The fact is that the British party, or those who will turn out against the Indemnity Bill will, with very few exceptions, comprise all who turned out for the British Government in its hour of need. And what, let me ask, will be the feelings of these men, when they read in the Times the following character of them by the tool of the British ministry?

"Take it all in all, we do not hesitate to say that neither the Chartist nor the Irish rebels exhibited such a complication of wickedness as the Canadian Tories. Our demagogues at home had at least some honourable pretences. They took up the cause of poverty and oppression. They sought liberty for those who, at least had never enjoyed power. They imagined their side to be the majority, and consistently with that belief they asked for a perfect representative system. Both in England and in Ireland a popular legislature was the immediate object of agitation."

"The rebels of 1837 were patriotic and honourable men compared with their present opponents. The former fought for free and equal institutions; the latter for the ascendancy of a faction and a race. The true rebels and those who, having provoked the rebellion of 1837, now show how unfit they ever were to govern by rebelling themselves the moment they cease to be paid for obedience."

EFFECTS OF THE LOSS OF CANADA.

If the crown and the public opinion were of the same mind as Lord Elgin and the Whigs, we must, of course, lose the Canadas forthwith; and it therefore becomes us to consider whether we are losing anything essential to national existence. If we lose Canada, not to dwell on the altered prospects to our emigrants, and the reduction of employment to our manufacturers, shooners, and sailors, where, I should like to ask Lord Grey, have we a supply of timber? It is well to know that we could not be supplied with one half what we want from the Baltic, even if we could depend on the continued friendship of the northern powers, which our experience of 1808 warns us from relying on; and if I were in Canada a state of the Union, I know that I would advocate an export duty on timber of at least ten dollars the load, for the United States require it all for themselves. Lord Grey might be impeached as having given away our only independent supply of an article essential to national existence, but all this will never recover for us an advantage which it is easy for us now to retain. The mode of retaining Canada and our other colonies is, in my opinion, very simple, while at the same time I believe not only that there is but one course for us, but that we must act promptly, especially in the case of Canada. I am sorry to trespass at so great a length on your columns, but I am anxious in conclusion to give my views of the steps at present necessary to be taken in colonial affairs, as I detailed them in a communication to the Secretary of the Colonies, pointing out the dangerous position of the Canadas, dated 11th ult.

"Nothing is more certain than that if the Church and College monopolies are not banished from British America the Anglo-Saxon population will remain dissatisfied, and gradually become disaffected; but, in the meantime, a more imminent danger has to be guarded off, and the British Government may depend on all the royalists of 1837 and 1838 putting their shoulders to the wheel. The parties who will have the disgrace of losing the Colonies (if they be lost) can only be your Lordship and Lord Elgin, by throwing obstacles in the only course left the British population to pursue. The only alternative left to the loyalists is to retain Upper Canada British, since they cannot make United Canada British or loyal. They will be sure to petition the Home Government as follows, and if your Lordship and Mr. Roebuck have no influence enough to get the prayer of the loyalists indignantly disregarded (as usual) the colonies will be saved; otherwise, much against their will, they will be state of the American Republic Union immediately. The Anglo-Saxon race will insist on the Union of the Canadas being broken up, the Island of Montreal and everything south of the Ottawa and St. Lawrence, as far down as Port St. Francis, including the Eastern Townships, being incorporated with Upper Canada."

"Thus would the Canadas be temporarily saved, and by this course, alone, will time enough be got to recognise our colonial Empire by the National reputation of Sir Robert Peel and his anti-British measure of 1846. Except with a view to the latter there is no use whatsoever in carrying the former reform; but, to leave no uncertainty about what I mean by the latter, I shall here state the practical way in which the legislation of 1846 may be so qualified as to secure permanently our Colonial Empire. Let us at once prove our faith in Free Trade by making the Colonies so far integral parts of the British Empire as to levy no duty on the sugar, corn, or other products of the Colonies, except on articles on which there is an excise duty in this country; and let us (in order to show our confidence in British manufacturing superiority, and to lead other nations to reciprocate with us to a reasonable extent) declare by the same act of Parliament that all foreign countries that will agree so to remodel their tariff as not to charge us more on any article than 15 per cent. on the British cost, shall stand on the same footing as the Colonies, and have their products received here free of all duty. And, as it is most reasonable that countries that will not agree even to such terms of reciprocal trade should have deducted from the price which their articles produce in this country a customs' duty in some degree equivalent to the taxes paid by British subjects producing the same articles, let us arrange that, on all such foreign articles as are not charged any duty, or are charged a less duty than 15 per cent. on the price in England, we should charge the said customs' duty of fifteen per cent. until the foreign country agrees to our proposition for reciprocal trade, or until we can agree to such other proposition as the foreigner may show to be more reasonable in his peculiar circumstances."

"By following the foregoing line of principle and policy I am confident the Canadas and the West Indies could, at once, be repossessed into the most prosperous and most loyal portions of the British Empire. I see also, however, that it is more likely that our national infatuation may continue till, in the British Colonies, in 1850, as in France in 1848, the melancholy words, 'It is now too late!' may come to be used; and, in such case the names of Peel and Grey will go down with infamy to posterity, as having reversed the British principle—that honesty is the best policy."

The colonists will feel entitled to blame the Times only for the incorrectness of the impressions it leaves on the public mind. As to its more violence or indignation of language, no class of her Majesty's subjects have, in this respect, so often to ask the indulgence of their neighbours as have the colonists themselves. Our opportunities abroad make us more alive to the vast unemployed advantages of the empire, as by such experience we are only confirmed in the sanguine idea, that if true to ourselves, this country has no need to despond, and that England has yet at command, the elements of greatness and happiness, in a degree possessed by no other county in the world. We are satisfied that (see from the circumstantial disadvantages of her church and aristocracy, and able to retain the disinterested social influences of these noble and time honoured institutions) England has an executive Government admitting of the prompt and independent execution of high designs, and containing within it capabilities at once of progress and accumulation, to a greater practical extent than does the principle of any other Government whatever. We see that her subjects may enjoy every advantage of democracy which a Republic offers, while they are saved the neutral evils of democracy which are inherent in a Republic. And as the first or one of the first steps to centralise the productive energies of England, I would make the colonies integral parts of the Empire. They should have their name even in common with the mother country and each other. And Britain in America, should not only be bound to Great Britain, but to Britain in India East and West by every thing which common interest, as well as common glory can create."

But, if the Government remains in the feeble hands of the Whigs, monarchy will be driven from America, and agitators will have it to say that nowhere but amid the wretchedness of European society would it be tolerated. They will even go the length of charging monarchical institutions with being the cause of all our wretchedness and misery as a nation. What a different prospect this from what I had formerly pictured to myself!—an hour of triumph for the colonies when we could point the calculators of British principles to the prosperous and happy condition of a great and moral population in British America—thus proving, that while British principles cannot (any more than any other principles feed our masses, they are so far from being any impediment to this, that in circumstances equally advantageous they are at

least as efficient an instrument of practical philanthropy as the boasted Republicanism of the United States. Your obedient humble servant,
ISAAC BUCHANAN.

Member for Toronto, then metropolis, in the first Parliament of United Canada, and formerly President of the Boards of Trade of Toronto and of Hamilton, Upper Canada.

Glasgow, 19th May, 1849.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.
COLONIAL REFORM.

MR. ROEBUCK then rose, and moved for leave to bring in a Bill for the better Government of certain of our Colonial Possessions. After alluding to the unsatisfactory condition of our colonies generally, and particularly to the perilous state of our North American dependencies, he entered upon the main purpose of his speech by admitting that a colonial empire was calculated to be of advantage to England. But what he meant by a colonial empire was not a number of barren wastes, possessed by the Crown of England, but a number of happy and prosperous communities, yielding a willing and cheerful obedience to our sway. But was such the colonial empire which we possessed? Far from it; and the reason of this was to be found in our defective system of colonial administration. Compared with the Americans we were yet but children in the art of colonization. By their superior management they induced the great bulk of the emigrants from this country to avoid our own colonies and settle in their wilds. The emigrant who settled in America did not find himself degraded, as he would to some extent if he settled in a colony. Whilst he urged the propriety of adopting a better system with regard to the colonies, he admitted the absurdity of attempting to deal with them all on the same footing. The measure which he sought to introduce, with a view to placing our colonial dependencies on a better footing, would apply to our dependencies in North America, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. For them he would have one system of law, in the first place, to secure their settlement; in the next, to apply to them after settlement; and lastly, to bring about that system of federation which was already feasible with regard to some, and would, by-and-by, be so with regard to them all, with the exception, perhaps, of New Zealand. He took the principle acted upon by the United States as his model. The American Government legislated for an infant State, whilst it was yet, in American political phraseology, a territory, and admitted it into the confederacy as a state on attaining a certain degree of maturity. This example he would wish to see followed by this country. Whilst he thought that a perfectly free trade should be established between the colonies and the mother country, he also thought that a fundamental colonial law should be enacted by the Imperial Parliament, which would first treat rising colonies as settlements, and afterwards, on their reaching maturity, to be ascertained by a census, to be taken every five years, provide for their admission as provinces, into a confederation of provinces, where such a confederation was possible. To carry out this principle he was of opinion that no land should henceforth be granted by the Crown but such as lay within the surveyed boundary of some distinct settlement. Such was the course which the Government ought now to pursue, with respect, at least, to the British North American provinces. To them, as well as to the other colonies named, a predetermined rule should be made to apply. We should give up our mischievous system of legislating merely for the present, and legislate for the future. The principle which he sought to establish would at once constitute the American provinces into a great confederate state, these provinces being already ripe for such a state of political being. The day for the independence of these provinces must and would come. But he wished that that independence, when achieved, should be achieved amicably, and not in the midst of turmoil and war. They must either part from us as friends or as enemies. If as friends, they would remain our allies after they ceased to be our dependencies, and act as a counterpoise to the power of the United States. To carry out his plan, he would again separate Upper and Lower Canada, and define accurately the boundaries between, as he should also do the boundaries between the other provinces. He would then give a separate legislature for each province, and a federal legislature for the whole. A governor-general should act as executive magistrate of the confederation. He should be appointed by his country, and his appointment should constitute the only positive tie between the mother country and its confederate dependencies. Such was the main outline of the plan which he would propose, and he trusted that the House would not refuse him leave to bring in his Bill.

Mr. HAWES followed, and objected even to the introduction of the Bill. In doing so he could not be charged with objecting to that of which he was ignorant, for both the principle and details of the proposed measure had been most elaborately explained to the house. The plan proposed was obvious to many objections, no matter to what dependency it was sought to apply it, but as regarded our North American colonies it would be found to be surrounded by insuperable difficulties. It involved a repeal of the Canada Union Act. That was now impossible, as the Upper Canadians would never consent that the lower part of their great outlet to the ocean, the St. Lawrence should be again within the jurisdiction of another province quite independent of them. It would also involve a breach of faith with the Canadian Legislature; for all, or nearly all, the wild land which formerly belonged to the Crown, had been, for certain considerations, made over to the local legislature. The Crown had therefore, in North America, nothing on which to operate in carrying out the hon. and learned gentleman's plan. His proposed settlements were the germ of the hon. and learned gentleman's scheme. But these settlements were impossible in the different dependencies to which the scheme would be extended. The foundation, therefore, of the whole plan gave way. But even supposing the settlements possible, they would be found inferior to the mode of colonization and settlement now in actual operation. He concurred in the proposal of colonial confederation, where such was feasible, and the main purpose of the bill which he was about to introduce for the Australian colonies would be, to confer representative institutions upon them separately, and to unite them all together, with a common form of legislation, in all matters affecting the whole of these colonies. Even if the proposed settlements were practicable, there was no provision in the Bill for meeting their expense. The hon. gentleman concluded by expressing a hope that the house would not consent even to the introduction of the Bill.

DEATH OF MISS EDGEWORTH.

The death of one who has done such solid services as Miss Edgeworth rendered to the cause of education and social morality cannot be recorded without a passing word of retrospective praise. Miss Edgeworth had long since ceased to take an active part in life, or in that world of literature of which she was once so bright an ornament. But she has taken her rank, and will keep it so long as youth have to be instructed in the elements of social morality. As a woman of singular intellectual acquirements she takes her place by some of the most distinguished of her sex who have adorned the present era. Her novels and miscellaneous works, more especially her descriptions of Irish life—which are in the main as true now as they were some twenty or thirty years ago—will always retain for her a high place in the literature of her country. But the works in which she especially shone, and for which she will hereafter be remembered, were those delightful stories written in so beautifully simple a style, down to the capacity of children, in which the childish mind is made first to comprehend its part in the great drama of social life. What has had in early life her "Harry and Lucy," "Early Lessons," "Frank," "Novels" and "Ormond," has forgotten the fine moral lessons these conveyed in such simple incidents and homely language and thoughts? But Miss Edgeworth's literary talent was not confined to this class of works. A mere list of her different writings shows her versatility. We give the mere names, without reference to the date of publication: "Belinda," "Castle Rackrent," "Early Lessons," "Fashionable Tales," and the "Modern Griselda," "Frank," "Garry Owen," "Harrington," "Harry and Lucy," "Helen," "Laurent le Paroisseux,"

"Leona," "Little Plays for young People," "Moral Tales," "Ormond," "Parent's Assistant," "Patronage and Comic Dramas," "Popular Tales," "Readings in Poetry," "Rosamond," "Tales," &c.

This list is enough to show that Miss Edgeworth was a "worker"—that she fairly performed her share of the duty allotted to us—the more honourable in her, because it was for the most part spontaneous service.

Miss Edgeworth was the daughter of Mr. Richard Lovell Edgeworth, of Edgeworth's Town. Her life presents no incidents. It was divided between literary composition and the performance of local duties. She was a woman of a very superior order—beloved by all who approached her, and respected, for her talents and accomplishments, by some of the first men of the age. Although what is commonly termed a "blue," she had none of the characteristics which have attracted to "learned ladies" the reproach of too much learning. She was most unaffected and agreeable in private intercourse, and, as in her books, never obtruded her knowledge and her opinions. In addition to the above-mentioned works, we may mention that she contributed by far the most valuable portion to Mr. R. L. Edgeworth's "Treatise on Practical Education." Miss Edgeworth died on the 21st May, at Edgeworth's Town, after a short illness.

RATE IN AID BILL.

The Lords have shown their usual good sense by passing the Rate-in-Aid Bill, without much ado. Considering the large proportion of members in that house personally interested in the prescriptive immunities of Irish property, we are thankful for the motives, whatever they were, which won their consent, or neutralized their opposition to this measure. Had they thrown it out they would have produced a rather serious situation of affairs. Such a step, though negative in form, would have had the positive effect of adding to the taxation of this island far more than its just share. A costly work is before us. Twenty-one unions of Ireland, extending over half its coast, and containing a population enormously in excess of their present resources, will for some time require foreign aid. Half a million, perhaps, is not too large an estimate of the sum required merely for keeping the people alive. Who is to pay it? England will contribute to this, as well as a dozen other forms of Irish relief, by paying the famine-tax on property and income. But is Ireland to contribute nothing to the Imperial necessity? Are the Irish proprietors to help none but "their own poor," in the local and selfish sense of the term? If so, the whole of these twenty-one unions, together with many other pauperised districts will be thrown wholly on England, and will compel a continuance of her peculiar burdens. Thus a rejection of the Rate-in-Aid Bill would have put the Lords into the awkward position of levying taxes against the expressed remonstrance of the Commons.—Times.

The Milan Gazette, of the 17th, contains a letter from the Austrian headquarters before Bologna, dated the 14th, announcing that on the previous day, the besieged had made a sortie, which was repulsed with the loss of three pieces of artillery.

Leghorn was still in a state of siege on the 16th. A number of executions had taken place, and among the sufferers were several Frenchmen. A French priest was to have been shot on the 15th, but the commanders of the flexible and Tumore, assisted by the consul, interfered and obtained a reprieve. It was believed at Leghorn that the Austrian division, commanded by General d'Aspre, would march to Rome. A portion of the garrison of Leghorn was sent, on the 14th, to reinforce the Austrian corps laying siege to Bologna.

Genoa was tranquil on the 17th. The difficulties in obtaining Hungarian intelligence are daily increasing. A circular has been forwarded to the editors of the various Vienna papers, in which the military commander warns them "for the last time," to eschew publishing any news of the position, strength, and manoeuvres of the Austrian or Hungarian corps, excepting always the case of the official publication of such intelligence.

The Constitutionelle Zeitung states that the whole of the Banat is in the power of the Hungarians, with the sole exception of Temeswar, which town is now subjected to a close blockade.

The Emperor of Austria has addressed a proclamation to the people of Hungary, in which he ascribes to the Hungarians war to the intrigues of a criminal faction, and informing them that in order to suppress that faction he (the Emperor of Austria) has leagues with the Russian Czar. He adjures the Hungarian people to consider the Russian auxiliaries as friends and allies, assuring them that these auxiliaries will vie with the Austrian soldiers in protecting the lives, property, and liberty of all peaceful citizens.

In Dresden the trial of the prisoners is proceeding, not before a court-martial, but the ordinary tribunals. The Russian, Bakunin was the real leader of the insurrection; he soon instituted a kind of reign of terror; his band of fanatics disregarded all applications to extend some protection to the museums and galleries of art in the city, and it is a wonder they have escaped with so little injury. As it is, the loss of the collection of shells, minerals, corals and fishes, among the best of Europe, is irreparable. It was destroyed by the fire that devastated part of the Zwinger. In the old opera house only a small portion of the decorations and set scenes, used in the present one when wanted, were burned. The portion of the Zwinger destroyed will not be easily replaced, for the funds will be wanting. Besides the old opera three houses in the Brudergasse, next the palace of the Prince, and three others in the Zwingerstrasse, were burnt down by order; he who gave it is unknown. It has been discovered that the insurrection in Dresden and the present movement in Baden were connected with each other. To give a notion of the rigour of the Provisional Government during the three days it existed, a Dresden journal states that no less than 77 persons of all ranks and both sexes were arrested and thrown into prison by it; among them was a prince of Anhalt-Dessau, under an assumed name.

ELECTRIC TELEGRAPH IN THE RIVER THAMES.

At a Report of Common Council held on Thursday, a report was brought up from the Thames Navigation and Port of London Committee for making a deed relative to laying down the electric telegraph in the river Thames. It stated that the committee had taken into consideration the application of Messrs. Blunt, civil engineers, for permission to lay down an electric telegraph in the river Thames, to communicate with a coast-line telegraph; that, as the committee were of opinion that the proposal for laying down the lines was of public and national importance, they were disinclined to prohibit or embarrass the undertaking, and therefore did not object to its being carried into effect, but did not authorize it so as to incur any responsibility, leaving Messrs. Blunt to lay down lines at their own risk, they undertaking to do no damage, either to the public or to individuals, and to stop all further works when required so to do, and to remove any work that shall be found injurious.—The report was agreed to, and the city seal was set to the conditions prescribed by the city solicitor.

WAR MEDALS.—About 70 war medals have been distributed within the last two days to various soldiers at Chatham. Among them was William Marshall, late of the 95th Rifles, who has received a medal with six clasps—for Vittoria, Pyrenees, Nivelles, Nive, Orthez, and Toulouse. He has been 24 years in the service, 20 years a non-commissioned officer, and 10 years Quarter-Master Sergeant. He served in the Peninsula until the end of the war, and was with the army in front of New Orleans.

