

# LORD MONCK AND THE CANADIAN NATION

C. P. STACEY

CHARLES STANLEY, Viscount Monck, last of the Governors-in-Chief of British North America and first Governor General of the Dominion of Canada, has received rather less than his due of recognition from Canadian historians. Some accounts of his period even display a tendency to belittle him. He was not a popular figure during his viceroyalty, and to-day his name has been forgotten by the Canadian public. Yet there seems no doubt that he deserves a very honourable place among those whom Canadians term the Fathers of Confederation; nor is his direct connexion with that great measure Canada's only debt to this able and pertinacious Irishman.

He governed Canada during one of the most tempestuous and critical epochs of her history: from 1861 to 1868. He had scarcely stepped upon Canadian soil when he found himself faced with the perils of the *Trent* affair—when war with the United States was closer than at any other time between 1815 and the present day. From the feverish weeks when, in the teeth of that crisis, hoping against hope that the transports racing from England with the Guards would get up the St. Lawrence before the ice sealed that gateway for the winter, he consulted ministers and military men whom he had not had time to learn to know on the details of raising volunteers and constructing batteries, to the day when at last he sailed for home, leaving behind him a new nation which seven years before had been no more than a dream cherished by a few large-minded patriots, there was but little rest for Lord Monck.

Practically all of the thorny difficulties that confronted him were products of a great crisis south of the border. The American Civil War was running its terrible course. The Northern States had become, almost overnight, the greatest military power on earth, and were growing, it seemed, ever more and more unfriendly towards Britain. Like a dark threatening cloud, their might hung above British America; and it was Monck's great concern, first, to do what could be done to avert the storm, and secondly, to ensure that if it burst it would not find Canada unprepared. The first object was best served by maintaining a strictly enforced

neutrality towards the American situation. This was no easy matter, with Canadian cities swarming with Confederate agent and refugees, and large sections of Canadian opinion enlisted on their behalf. Everything indicates, however, that Monck did his duty with admirable judgment and restraint; and it is not too much to say that he deserves to be remembered, along with Lord Lyons and Charles Francis Adams, the diplomatic representatives whom the crisis so fortunately found serving their countries in Washington and London respectively, as having made a great contribution towards preventing what would have been from every point of view a most shocking catastrophe.

The second task was even harder. How prevail upon the Canadians, a thoroughly unmilitary people who had never had to think for themselves in such matters, to make defensive preparations adequate to such an emergency? Monck did what he could, though his action was, of course, hampered by the fact that since the concession of responsible government the domestic authority of the Governor-General had shrunk to small proportions. By his own speeches he strove to keep the issue of national defence before the public; while he kept it before his ministers by repeated urgings, not scrupling, on occasion, to give them a glimpse of the mailed fist.<sup>1</sup> He encountered many rebuffs and disappointments, of which the bitterest was the defeat of John A. Macdonald's celebrated Militia Bill of 1862. Nevertheless, the progress of events in the adjacent country gradually produced in the public mind some sense of impending peril; and before the Southern Confederacy came to an end on the field of Appomattox, the Governor General had had the satisfaction of reporting to Westminster increases in the Canadian parliament's appropriations for military purposes which, if not proportioned to the existing danger, were yet very considerable.

To Monck—as to the Imperial Government which he served—it was probably through its significance in connection with this question of defence that the Confederation project made its primary appeal. Union meant increased military efficiency and a correspondingly firmer basis for British power in North America. In consequence, Monck, within the limits imposed upon him by his office, fought the battle of union with a determination which no Canadian politician could have surpassed. When in the summer of 1864 there arose the possibility of the formation in the province of Canada of a coalition Government—a Government pledged to the

1. See his note to John Sandfield Macdonald, Oct. 24, 1862: copy in Monck to Newcastle, (separate), Nov. 15, 1862: Public Archives of Canada, Series G, vol. 464, p. 349. The only result was a defiance from Macdonald's government.

federation of the provinces of British America—he used all his influence to further the scheme. In a series of interviews with the leaders of rival groups in the local parliament, he tactfully shepherded them towards co-operation, playing a part not dissimilar to that which the Crown is believed to have played in the formation of the present “National” Government in Britain. It is highly probable that it was the influence of his personality and his great position, reinforcing the effect of the *impasse* which had been reached in Canadian politics, that supplied the final impulse to bring about the unlikely combination of those two old enemies, John A. Macdonald and George Brown, in a ministry dedicated to great enterprises.<sup>1</sup> Monck himself certainly believed that his mediation had played an important part towards effecting this end. He considered in fact that he had used his influence to the extent of (to use his own words) “in some measure overstepping the strict line of his constitutional duties;” and he used this fact as an argument in urging action upon his ministers at a later time when he considered that they were not pushing the federation measure rapidly enough<sup>2</sup>.

The federal system drawn up for the Dominion was in practically every respect the creation of colonial statesmanship. The *British North America Act* of 1867 was little more than the resolutions agreed upon by the Quebec Conference of 1864 expressed in legislative terms, and the Imperial Government showed no great desire to interfere with the details of the scheme. Monck, however, as in duty bound, put his views on these details upon paper for the information of the Colonial Office. As might have been expected in the circumstances, he showed a bias in favour of extreme centralization, disliking the very word “federal”. His ideas in this respect, in fact, went far beyond the bounds of practical politics<sup>3</sup>. But in addition to his observations on governmental details, he made at the same time some further suggestions which are of unusual interest.

It has long been known that at the final conference on the details of federation, held in London, the Canadians urged that the new political entity soon to be created should be termed “the Kingdom of Canada,” but that the word “Dominion” was substituted for “Kingdom” at the request of the Imperial Government.

1. See R. G. Trotter, “Lord Monck and the Great Coalition of 1864”, in the *Canadian Historical Review*, III: June, 1922.

2. Monck’s memorandum of June 6, 1866, published in Sir Joseph Pope’s *Memoirs of Sir John Alexander Macdonald* (London, 1894) I, 372-3. Original in Public Archives, Series G, vol. 180 B, p. 202.

3. Monck to Carnarvon (confidential), Sept. 7, 1866. Draft in Series G, vol. 180 B, pp. 212 ff.

Some writers have represented the change, in the light of later events, as perhaps serving to retard Canada's advance to equality of status with the Mother Country within the Empire; and the late Mr. John S. Ewart made the episode the text of a series of vigorous nationalist tracts.<sup>1</sup> Sir John Macdonald's statement of the facts, made in a letter written long afterwards, has often been quoted:

The declaration of all the B. N. A. provinces, that they desired as one Dominion to remain a portion of the Empire, showed what wise government and generous treatment would do, and should have marked an epoch in the history of England. This would probably have been the case had Lord Carnarvon, who as Colonial Minister had "sat at the cradle" of the New Dominion, remained in office. His ill-omened resignation was followed by the appointment of the late Duke of Buckingham, who had as his adviser the then Governor General, Lord Monck—both good men, certainly, but quite unable, from the constitution of their minds, to rise to the occasion. The Union was treated by them much as if the B. N. A. Act were a private Bill uniting two or three English parishes. Had a different course been pursued—for instance, had united Canada been declared to be an auxiliary Kingdom, as it was in the Canadian draft of the Bill—I feel sure (almost) that the Australian Colonies would, ere this, have been applying to be placed in the same rank as "The Kingdom of Canada...."

P. S.—On reading the above over, I see that it will convey the impression that the change of title from Kingdom to Dominion was caused by the Duke of Buckingham. This is not so. It was made at the instance of Lord Derby, then Foreign Minister, who feared the first name would wound the sensibilities of the Yankees. I mentioned this incident in our history to Lord Beaconsfield, at Hughenden in 1879, who said "I was not aware of the circumstance, but it is so like Derby, a very good fellow, but who lives in a region of perpetual funk."<sup>2</sup>

This letter, written by Macdonald only two years before his death, is inaccurate in more respects than one. Carnarvon's resignation, for instance, did not take place until long after the drafting of the *British North America Bill* was complete, and he held office long enough to introduce it in the House of Lords. Furthermore, the letter seems to bracket Monck with Buckingham as indifferent to the national aspirations of Canada and unappreciative of the significance of the changes that took place during his administration. Mr. Ewart to the end of his life believed

1. *The Kingdom of Canada... and other Essays* (Toronto, 1908).

2. Quoted in Pope, *Memoirs*, I, 312-13 (Macdonald to Knutsford, July 18, 1889). At greater length in John S. Ewart, "False Political Phrases", *Canadian Historical Review*, XIV: June, 1933.

apparently that this was the true state of affairs.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, there is ample evidence in the Public Archives to prove that the imputation against Lord Monck is unjust. It consists of the draft of a confidential despatch which he sent to Lord Carnarvon on September 7, 1866.<sup>2</sup> The despatch runs as follows:

My Lord,

In another despatch of this date I have endeavoured to place before your Lordship my views as to the constitution of the proposed Union of the British North American Provinces.

There remain some incidental subjects upon which I desire to express my opinions.

By the 71st article of the resolutions of the Quebec plan it is provided "that H. M. shall be solicited to determine the rank and name of the Confederated Provinces."

There exists—in Canada and I think also in the other Provinces—a very strong desire that H. M. would be graciously pleased to designate the Union a "Kingdom" and to give to Her representative the title of Viceroy.

This, of course, is a sentimental feeling and one that on first sight may appear of trivial moment, but I cannot think that in any Country, and particularly in one circumstanced, politically & geographically, as these Provinces, are the adoption of a policy which tends to bind the pride and affections of the people to their domestic institutions ought to be neglected.

This aspiration is founded on no desire to found an independent Kingdom, ["separate from the Crown of England" is here deleted]; the attachment of the population of these provinces to their Sovereign and to their Fatherland is beyond question and requires residence among them in order to be fully appreciated. The wish is based on a consciousness of their increasing importance, and a desire on their part to reconcile their highly prized position in reference to the Crown of England with the natural yearning of a growing people to emerge, at least in name, from the Provincial phase of existence.

With regard to the *name* of the intended Union I would suggest that Canada should be adopted as the general designation, and that suitable names derived from old local associations sh<sup>d</sup> be given to the provinces hitherto called Upper and Lower Canada.<sup>3</sup>

There are two other points intimately connected with the future political development of this country to which I desire to point your Lordship's attention.

1. See his article "False Political Phrases", just referred to.

2. Series G, vol. 180 B, pp. 221 ff.

3. It is interesting to remember that when this proposal reached the Queen, she requested, before approving it, that an assurance should be given her that it was agreeable to the people of the communities concerned. Lord Carnarvon replied that while the matter had not, of course, been referred to the populations directly, this arrangement was "the unanimous wish" of the delegates of the various provinces. "It was proposed in their Conference," he wrote, "by a representative of one of the Maritime Provinces, and it is felt by the delegates from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to be for the political advantage of the Confederation, that it should be known by a name which is at once familiar and important." G. E. Buckle, ed., *Letters of Queen Victoria*, second series, I, 392-94.

First—I think the feeling at present in Canada is very strong in favour of monarchical gov<sup>t</sup> as it exists in the British system.

I assume that it is the desire of H. M. Gov<sup>t</sup> to foster and strengthen that feeling.

I think it is generally agreed that limited monarchy cannot very long exist without the interposition of some class endowed with social & political privileges between the sovereign and the mass of the people.

Limited monarchy without this element is in truth Republicanism under another name.

The want of the material in a new country for creating an hereditary aristocracy is one of the great difficulties in the way of applying the institutions of the British constitution to our Colonies, and yet, without this or some substitute for it, we are in fact training up the minds of our Colonists not to the ideas of monarchy but of republicanism.

I can see that, even in a Colony so much advanced as this is, it would be absurd to introduce hereditary titles of any kind. The experiment was tried some time since in the creation of baronets, and it is needless to say more than that in almost every instance it has proved a failure, tending rather to bring hereditary honours into contempt than to any other conclusion.

It has, however, occurred to me that the members of the Upper House of Parliament might for life be given titles accompanied with social precedence in the same manner as honorary designations are assumed by the Scotch Judges, and that in this way the minds of the people might be habituated to titular distinctions without the inconveniences w<sup>h</sup> in the present social condition of the country would attend the introduction of hereditary rank.

The second point to w<sup>h</sup> I wish to advert is the absence of the power of conferring any honorary distinction as a reward for important public service.

It is unnecessary to adduce arguments to prove that in addition to the consciousness of having performed his duty, man generally prizes highly some external decoration which testifies the public appreciation of his having done so.

Hitherto the only decoration given in Canada as a reward for public service has been the civil companionship of the Bath.

Though this decoration is highly valued, and I would not be understood as suggesting that it should *never* be conferred, yet if it is to be the *only* mark of distinction for special merit in so large a community as will now be formed by the Union of these Provinces, it is I think plain that one of two inconvenient results must follow. Either it must be conferred so sparingly as to omit a large number who would be fairly entitled to some mark of public favour, or if it be given in sufficient quantity to embrace all these it will become so common as to diminish its value as an Imperial mark of distinction.

The plan which I would suggest for your Lordship's consideration to meet the want to which I have referred would be the

institution of an order of Knighthood for B. N. A. on the model of the Order of the Star of India, to be called "the Order of St. Lawrence."

I have now exhausted all the suggestions which I desire to bring before your Lordship's mind in connection with the "new departure" which this community is about to take in its national life.

I trust your Lordship will not think that I have gone beyond the line of my proper duty in laying these observations before you.

I have been engaged for five years in earnest study of the requirements, social and political, of the people of these provinces, and your Lordship will perceive that I have not permitted any motives—personal or otherwise—to interfere with my desire to lay before you fully and frankly every opinion which appeared to me likely to lead to a course of action tending to their permanent welfare.

This despatch serves to exonerate Monck from the accusation that he was not alive to the vast possibilities that were latent in the federation measure, and failed to claim for the Dominion at its inception all the dignities to which it might have been entitled. And it may be admitted that (in the circumstances of 1866) it would have been difficult to improve upon his succinct exposition of the aspirations that lay behind the Canadians' suggestion for the use of the word "Kingdom".

As for the matter of rewards and titles of honour, it is easy, to-day, to smile at Monck's laboured arguments; but we must be wary of judging 1866 merely by the standards of 1934. The idea that the most essential component of constitutional monarchy is a privileged class seems curiously quaint to us, but it was entertained by many capable Britons besides Lord Monck in the days between the first and second Reform Bills. When Monck wrote these lines, England was not yet a democracy (Disraeli's "leap in the dark", the extension of the franchise to urban labourers, came the next year), and much was heard of the theory of a "balanced" government in which Crown, Aristocracy and People had each a distinct part to play. The idea is to be found in the correspondence of Lord Elgin, to whose political intelligence (one of the keenest of the century) Canada owes so much; and it is worth remembering that John A. Macdonald himself, in his speech in favour of Confederation in the provincial parliament, spoke in very much this vein, rejecting unalloyed "democracy" as worthy only of Lesser Breeds.

Monck's practical suggestions in this connexion, however, were not acted upon. The proposal to employ the members of the Dominion Senate in the capacity of an aristocratic leaven for

the loaf of democracy (an idea which in our own irreverent age might arouse some amusement) came to nothing in particular, for the appellation "Honourable", borne while they continued in office, was the only artificial means finally adopted for exalting them above their fellow men. And the other and more interesting suggestion, for the establishment of a distinctively Canadian order of knighthood (the title "The Order of St. Lawrence", so carefully supplied, seems somehow less suggestive of Monck's workaday utilitarianism than of the aesthetic ingenuity of his predecessor, Sir Edmund Head) was scarcely luckier. Such a step at that moment would (as Monck well knew) have been almost tantamount to an admission that Confederation had raised Canada's status in the eyes of the Imperial authorities; and for this, apparently, the Colonial Office was not ready. It chose, at any rate, to adopt instead a rather characteristic half-measure.

At the time of the fall of Napoleon, Britain had acquired a protectorate over the Ionian Islands; and in 1818 a special order of knighthood, the Order of St. Michael and St. George, was instituted to reward services rendered in connection with these and other British possessions in the Mediterranean. In 1864, however, the British Government, as the result of various circumstances (of which the cost of garrisoning them was not the least) ceded the islands to Greece. The Order's occupation, so to speak, was now practically gone. Somebody, however, hit upon the idea of altering its statutes and using it to recognize services performed in the British colonies generally; and at the end of 1868 this was done. Thus Canada, instead of getting an order of her own as Monck had recommended, was accorded a share of one originally intended to conciliate the political feelings of a little group of Mediterranean islands. This was not the form in which a system of titles of honour was best calculated to appeal to a community in which democratic ideas had already made progress to a deplorable extent; and it is not surprising to find the leading newspaper of British America regarding the innovation with decidedly lukewarm enthusiasm.<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to speculate upon the question of whether Canadian feeling might have become more friendly towards the introduction of such distinctions if the Colonial Office had seen its way clear to accept Monck's suggestion.

As we have already seen, the Governor-General's representations on behalf of the adoption of the name "Kingdom" for the new federation were unsuccessful. The phrase "one united dominion under the name of the kingdom of Canada" in the Canadian

1. *Toronto Globe*, Jan. 4, 1869.



draft of the *British North America Bill* became simply "one dominion under the name of Canada" in the final version that went to parliament.<sup>1</sup> Yet it is a notable fact that this outcome did not put a period to Monck's attempts to obtain from the Imperial Government some official recognition of the fact which was so clear to his own mind—that the union of the provinces had marked a definite advance in the status of British America within the Empire. Now that the die had been cast in favour of the new and rather curious and indefinite term "Dominion", he was prepared to urge that this appellation should be regarded as one of special significance and dignity.

This appears in another confidential despatch which he sent to the Duke of Buckingham, who had now replaced Carnarvon at the Colonial Office, not long before his term of office in Canada came to an end. The question had arisen as to whether the members of the Canadian Privy Council (a body which had come into existence at Confederation) should be designated "Right Honourable" like Imperial Privy Councillors, or merely "Honourable". The Colonial Office ruled in favour of the latter title. Monck's despatch, dated August 11, 1868, urges reconsideration of this decision.<sup>2</sup>

My Lord Duke,

In reference to Your Grace's despatch marked "Separate" of July 25th in answer to mine of August 2nd, 1867, on the subject of the honorary titles proposed to be conferred on persons holding positions of eminence in this Dominion, I trust Your Grace will not think that I am venturing beyond the bounds of official propriety in asking Your Grace to reconsider the decision which has been arrived at with respect to the designation accorded to Privy Councillors of Canada.

I would suggest that the analogy of other parts of H. M.'s Colonial Possessions does not apply to this case.

For the first time in the Colonial history of Great Britain a portion of her Colonial Empire has been elevated by H. M. from the rank of a Province to that of a distinct "Dominion."

I have reason to know that if peculiar local considerations had not in the opinion of some persons rendered it undesirable, the designation would have probably been that of "Kingdom."

The Council who were appointed to advise the Queen's representative were at the same time designated "The Queen's Privy Council for Canada", a position which hitherto in all parts of H. M. Dominions where it obtains has always I believe carried with it the title of "Right Honourable."

I have reason to think that these changes have given great satisfaction to the people of Canada, but I will not conceal from

1. W. P. M. Kennedy, *The Constitution of Canada* (Oxford, 1922) 315.

2. Public Archives of Canada, Series G, "Confidential Despatches 1867-1873" (Copies) pp. 63 ff.

Your Grace my opinion that the pleasure with which they have been regarded will be very much diminished if it shall be found that the position of the highest responsibility and honour to which a Canadian subject can aspire carries with it no higher designation than that which has been heretofore accorded to the holders of comparatively insignificant offices.

I think there is another view of the subject which is not unworthy of consideration.

Canada is situated alongside of a great Republic which repudiates in its Constitution all titles of honour, but which—strangely enough—attaches the designation of Honorable to the tenure of a great number of official positions.

If Canadians are to imagine that their highest official title is precisely the same as that which is granted in the U. S. it appears to me that their minds will be led to the conclusion that so far as the honorary distinctions open to them are concerned—and mankind is liable to be influenced by such considerations—there is no difference between their own monarchical form of government and the republican system which prevails amongst their neighbours.

One of the chief difficulties attending the full application to Colonies of the principle and practice of the British Constitution has been the difficulty—from the social conditions of the country—of introducing any aristocratic element, and the only mode of meeting this difficulty which occurs to me, and of preventing society from assuming a dead level incompatible with the maintenance of monarchical institutions, is to seize every opportunity of conferring titles for life which shall gratify the recipient without entailing a burden on his posterity.

Such an occasion is that which I believe now presents itself in the Constitution of the Privy Council of Canada, and if it is considered desirable to foster in the Dominion a feeling of preference for that combination of the simple forms of Gov<sup>t</sup> which characterizes the British Constitution, and to strengthen the sentiment of loyalty by exhibiting the Crown as the source and the subject as the recipient of honour, I do not think it ought to be thrown away.

I may add that the practice of the U. S. has rendered the title of "Honorable" so common in America as to deprive it of all value.

Here again, Monck's insistence on the necessity of maintaining in Canada some sort of element to play the part of an aristocracy may provoke a smile in an age which sees nothing anomalous in the co-existence of monarchical and democratic institutions. But his clear enunciation of the principle that Confederation has raised British North America to a status superior to that of a mere "colony" does credit to his political sagacity, and the whole development of imperial relations since his day serves to demonstrate that his judgment was sound.

It need hardly be added that on the particular point at issue at the moment—which after all was not itself particularly important, though it had very large implications—the Colonial Office proved to be adamant. Members of the Canadian Privy Council to-day still bear only the title “Honourable”, and the fact that certain of the most important figures in Canadian public life sport the distinguished prefix “Right” is due only to the fact that they have been sworn of the Imperial Privy Council. Canada since Confederation has had five Prime Ministers—Mackenzie, Abbott, Thompson, Bowell, and Tupper—who remained mere “Honourables” throughout their time in office.<sup>1</sup>

Chiefly perhaps because they were of a nature not obvious to the public eye, Lord Monck’s very valuable services to Canada were ill requited by the people who profited by them. His last months in the Dominion were embittered by an attempt on the part of parliament to reduce the Governor-General’s salary—an attempt made in a fashion that almost amounted to a direct affront to himself. Sir John Macdonald described the affair in a letter to Tupper which must be quoted in any account of Monck’s services, however brief:

The only matter that went wrong during the whole session was a measure to reduce the salary of the Governor General from £10,000 sterling to \$32,000. The Government opposed this with all their might, but there was a regular stampede of friends and foes in favour of the reduction, and no arguments could avail. . . I was a good deal surprised to find that Lord Monck was very unpopular among the members of parliament. Why, I cannot say. I like him amazingly, and shall be very sorry when he leaves, as he has been a very prudent and efficient administrator of public affairs. Still, he seems not to have the power of making friends, and there is a bitterness of feeling displayed towards him for which I was altogether unprepared. Some of his unpopularity is attributable to his being supposed to lean towards the anti-colonial party in England, and some imprudent expressions of his when he first came to Canada strengthened that opinion. Godley, his private secretary, who is supposed to speak his opinions, was an out-and-out follower of Bright and Goldwin Smith, and did not hesitate to state his opinion that the sooner England got rid of her colonies the better. With all this, I regret much that Lord Monck is going away. He has managed the relations between Canada and the United States ever since he has been Governor, and during all the American war, with infinite discretion. The slightest mistake on our frontier might have created a war, in the excited state of feeling that existed in the United States. I think that Lord Monck

1. See the list of ministries in *The Canada Year Book*, 1933, p. 73. Sir Charles Tupper was sworn of the Imperial Privy Council in 1908, years after his short tenure of power had ended.

feels the passage of the Bill a good deal, not that it is of any pecuniary consequence to him, but because the House refused to postpone the reduction during his incumbency, and made it commence from the 1st of July. The Bill has, of course, been reserved for the Royal assent. Lord Monck had no option, inasmuch as Lord Elgin in 1851 received positive instructions from Earl Grey, when Colonial Minister, to reserve any Bill affecting the Governor's salary, and those instructions have never been revoked.<sup>1</sup>

The Royal assent to the bill was withheld, on the ground that it would be impossible for the Imperial Government to obtain the services as Governor General of a statesman of the necessary standing if the salary attached to the office was inadequate to the maintenance of its dignity. This, of course, could do nothing to salve Monck's injured feelings.

The charge of anti-colonialism against Monck can hardly be supported in the face of the evidence produced above. But in one important respect he certainly agreed with the Little Englanders of the Manchester School: he believed, and not without good reason, that in the colonies the assertion of autonomy had far outrun the assumption of responsibility, and that it was high time for these communities to take upon themselves many of the burdens, particularly with respect to military defence, which the Mother Country had heretofore borne on their behalf. On his return home, he made in the House of Lords a vigorous speech in support of the new policy lately enunciated by Cardwell, which comprehended the withdrawal of Imperial forces from the self-governing colonies, whose peace-time garrisons had long been a heavy burden to the British taxpayer.<sup>2</sup> Monck's point of view, in fact, was precisely that which Mr. Gladstone had expressed in the debate on the *Canada Railway Loan Bill* which had accompanied the *British North America Bill*: it was desirable to produce among the people of British North America "more self-reliance, and more self-relying habits", and the best means of doing this was "to raise their political position to the very highest point... in order that with that elevated position their sense of responsibility may likewise grow."<sup>3</sup>

It has not always been so easy for Imperial officials as for home-grown politicians to obtain their deserts from the Canadian public; and it is clear that Lord Monck was in this respect a special

1. Macdonald to Tupper, May 25, 1868: in Pope, *Memoirs of Sir John Macdonald*, II, pp. 15-16.

2. *Hansard*, third series, CXCIV, 1420-36, (April 23, 1869).

3. *Ibid.*, CLXXXVI, 749-57, (March 28, 1867).

sufferer. The eminent though unostentatious services which he rendered to Canada at a great crisis in her history were rewarded by the representatives of the Canadian people with a public insult, and it was only comparatively recently that research into the records of his administration began to reveal those services' true extent and significance. It appears, however, that now, at long last, he is likely to have justice done him; and it can hardly be doubted that he will finally come to occupy a place of some importance in the complicated story of the era of Confederation.