

local legislatures will remain but who can tell us anything of their formation? I presume that nothing that we can urge will prevent the adoption of the scheme but I contend that it would be unfair for the British government to adopt such a measure without the sanction of our people. In connection with this subject I will quote from the *London Review* of March 17th:—

THE RECALL OF SIR CHARLES DARLING.—Mr. Cardwell has found it necessary to recall Sir Charles Darling, the Governor of the colony of Victoria, and we think it will be generally admitted that he has not taken this step on insufficient grounds. It will be in the recollection of our readers that the two branches of the Legislature of the colony came into conflict upon the financial schemes of the Government for the time being. The Lower House passed, the Upper House it was known would reject, the budget. In order to surmount this difficulty, the Appropriation Bill was tacked to the Bill imposing new customs duties. The Legislative Council was thus presented with the alternative of submitting to the dictation of the House of Assembly, or of leaving the Government without any legal power to levy taxes or to defray expenses; but, eventually, they chose the latter course, as they had a perfect right to do. Pressed by the difficulties of their situation, the Colonial Ministry, thereupon, resorted to more than one irregular and illegal means of raising the wind. It was clearly the duty of Sir Charles Darling, as the representative of the Queen, to refuse his sanction to acts of such a character. But he not only gave his cordial and earnest support to the politicians who were violating the Constitution, he did something even still more objectionable. Commenting on a despatch to the Colonial Secretary upon an address from the Legislative Council, he took it upon himself to express a hope that the gentlemen who had signed it would never be designated for the position of confidential advisers to the Crown, because it is "impossible that their advice could be received with any other feelings than those of doubt and distrust." When a Governor thus converts himself into a partisan, and descends from his constitutional eminence as the representative of the Crown, to participate in the party conflicts of the colony placed under his rule, it is clear that he can no longer discharge his delicate and dignified duties with success. His usefulness is at an end, and nothing remains but to replace him by some one who can maintain with greater firmness a position of impartiality, and can hold himself aloof with greater self-command from the excited passions which it is his duty to moderate. In a despatch of stinging but well-merited rebuke, Mr. Cardwell has insisted upon these obvious considerations, and has relieved Sir Charles Darling from the further exercise of functions which he has so grievously abused.—*London Review*, March 17.

The cases it may be said are not exactly similar because that governor went into opposition to the legislature of the Colony but our Lieut. Governor knows from the petitions that have been presented that the feeling of the country is against the scheme, and that if members would but rise and express the views of their constituents they would be found in opposition to the measure. Mr. Cardwell

should surely stay his hand before giving his assistance to the completion of the union under these circumstances. I will now read from the *New York Tribune* a paper well known to be honorable although published on this side of the Atlantic:—

REMOVAL OF A COLONIAL GOVERNOR.—Careless observers of the working of British institutions have been in the habit of assuming that the Imperial Government desired above all things to maintain its own supremacy in remote settlements, and that it is always disposed to back up its own local representative. These erroneous impressions may perhaps have been partially disturbed by the strange spectacle lately patent in Jamaica; and they will receive another rude shock in the news that has just reached us from Downing Street. Mr. Cardwell, the Colonial Secretary, has advised the Queen to recall Sir Charles Darling, some time Governor of the Colony of Victoria. The circumstances of the quarrel that arose between the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council, in which quarrel Sir Charles interfered injudiciously, or illegally, or both, are detailed in extracts from London papers cited above. We have only to add that Mr. Cardwell's despatch, displacing the Governor, most emphatically insists upon the determination of the Colonial Office at home to leave the Colonists to manage their own affairs, and points out most cogently the great blunder of the Governor in identifying himself irretrievably with any political parties. The despatch, we doubt not, will cause a flutter among the occupants of high places. For us, it has but a partial interest; because we knew well beforehand that British statesmen, one and all, have long since abandoned the idea of ruling freemen by edicts from home. If Jamaica be under the present melancholy state of things, an exception to this rule, it is because the five Blacks have shown themselves unworthy of free Government.

When the Lieut. Governor ventures to carry out any scheme of union in opposition to the wishes of the people he identifies himself improperly with a party. This House is elected to legislate according to the well understood wishes of the people, and this particular scheme, changing the constitution, it was never empowered to carry out. In adopting the scheme we do not carry out those wishes, and if the people had the opportunity of expressing their views they would return such a majority that twelve members would not be found to support the scheme. The Prov. Sec. said that it had been used as an argument on our side, in other places, that if this scheme were carried out not one of its supporters would get a seat at Ottawa. This I think very probable, but it makes our prospects still more unfavorable. We have in this House supporting Confederation a set of trained politicians. If these gentlemen went to the hustings, in all probability they would be rejected, and this would be a positive loss to the country. You would then have a new set of men meeting more astute statesmen, and the interests of the country would be insecure. I assure the Prov. Secretary of these facts for his own interest; and while I might consider that he would be no loss to us, we have men who have heretofore acted with and led us to care for the true