

But will the *Independent* tell me when the SPECTATOR informed him that "Quien Sabe" was *not* a Congregational minister." I thought that the SPECTATOR had given no information on that head. And if the *Independent* will look again he will find that when I said that "the remonstrances which had rained upon me had been called forth by the fact that 'Quien Sabe' has been speaking some plain words in truth," I was referring to criticisms on the Toronto pulpit, and not to "Ministers Wives."

The position taken by the United States Government in the matter of the Halifax Fisheries' Award is the most contemptible ever assumed by the Government of a civilized people. It is difficult to believe that such a thing could occur in this nineteenth century. An arbitration was demanded, was agreed to, and now is disputed by the party most eager for it at first. An issue has been raised by Mr. Secretary Evarts as to the Newfoundland dispute, which can have no possible bearing upon the Halifax award. But, the *Yankees* know that if they repudiate the award, England will not go to war to recover damages; and that, as the *Times* puts it, "they have nothing to fear save loss of the national self-respect and the uncomplimentary surprise of old-world nations." Those losses will not trouble them at all, for as a nation they have not yet begun to cultivate the sense of "self-respect."

The *World* tells a good story and moralises well on it thus:—

"When the Scotch papers described what manner of men the City of Glasgow Bank directors were, a little fact came out which I hope will not be lost sight of. I call particular attention to it, because it looks more like a jest than the grim fact which it is. One of the directors always most sternly refused to read a Monday's newspaper, because it had to be printed on the Sabbath-day. This is almost like the jest that in Scotland the hens are not allowed to lay eggs on Sunday. A Scotchman whom I know informs me that he was carefully trained as a boy to be a bank director, for he was not allowed to whistle to his dog on the Lord's day. He might call it in English, or call it in Gaelic, but whistling was devilish. It is to be hoped that the present exposure may have a good effect in reducing to its absurdity the Sabbatarianism which is the opprobrium of Scotch religion. These Scotch elders devour widows' houses without compunction, but they excommunicate a compositor who has an engagement on a daily paper, and therefore has to work on Sundays."

The Bishop of Peterborough is a sensible, as well as an eloquent man. His last proposal is good and should be carried out in the interests of Episcopal order and harmony. Seeing the impossibility of ever inducing the clergy to agree respecting the vestments rubric, he has suggested that it would be better to do away with it altogether and frame a new one. The only difficulty is that there is just as little likelihood of the clergy being at one on the new rubric, as there is of agreement on the old. And then the question comes, why not go further? Revise the Prayer-Book, and then there would be no further need for such farcical legislation as we had in the Public Worship Act.

The great English Earl has once again lifted up his voice at the banquet given by the Lord Mayor of London, and again he has spoken swelling words to the people. The banquet was opportune, for those who had been most confident were growing a little dubious about their inspired Grand Vizier, the logic of events making some impression on them. But once more they have been assured—India cannot be attacked, because every possible foe is too remote to allow of it; although the north-western frontier is not quite safe, and will need rectification—and invasion would be possible if Asia Minor and the Euphrates valley were held by a very strong or a very weak power, and Turkey is to be placed there as being neither the one nor the other. Yet, all but those blinded by the glitter of the Earl's phrases can see that Turkey will make herself strong by forming alliances with other powers at the first possible moment. And then once more the Earl announces that England will stand by the Berlin Treaty, though the other signatories should withdraw, and declares his readiness to appeal with confidence to the people to support the Government in maintaining the treaty "with all their energy and resources." If war is not brought about after all it will not be from any lack of indiscretion and bombast on the part of the Earl.

Dr. Butt, M. P. for Limerick, has issued an address to the electors of that city, which is virtually an appeal to the Home Rulers, not to carry on a policy of obstruction in the British House of Commons. Dr. Butt declares that for the Irish people to adopt, or encourage the policy proclaimed in the resolutions adopted at the Rotunda meeting in Dublin on the 22nd of October, would be simply suicidal. And he is right. The Obstructionists have made themselves ridiculous and contemptible in the House of Commons and in the country. Their policy can never advance, but will always work against their cause; and the sooner they listen to Dr. Butt and cultivate common sense and ordinary honesty the better for them and the people they represent.

EDITOR.

THE FUTURE RELATIONS OF CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

A great deal of anxiety is manifested in the political circles of Great Britain as to the mind of Canada toward the United States. Many profess to see in the result of our late elections, and the adoption of what is called a "National Policy," or a protective tariff, the introduction of the thin end of the wedge which shall separate us from the mother country. They seem to think that we hold our present relations lightly; that we are looking out for an opportunity to do well unto ourselves, and would disturb the existing condition of things if it would pay. The first answer is that in Canada there is a wide, and deep, and intense loyalty to Great Britain. The French portion of the population being Catholic can have nothing to gain by such a change of political relation. In the Province of Ontario the Roman Catholic Church has all the freedom and privileges it could ever hope to have from an American Government—it has more than it could reasonably claim in the Province of Quebec. So that the French need not be reckoned upon as friends of the scheme of annexation.

The Irish have not much love for England; they are eternally talking of their old grievances, their famine, their disabilities, and such like things. But they know well enough that they have nothing to gain by a change of government; for they are as free here as they are in the United States to talk any amount of treason; they can advocate "Home Rule," or "Repeal," or any other absurdity to their heart's content. Orators like Father Graham may stand up and indulge in the wildest dreams about the good time coming, when Ireland shall not merely be free from British misrule and oppression, but shall have its revenge slaked in the blood of its ancient foes, and sway a triumphant sceptre; they are free to cheer the fine sentiments of the rev. lecturer, when he predicts the speedy loss of Britain's commercial supremacy, when "her colonies will separate from her, and gradually, but surely, the process of dissolution will advance when the hour of destiny will strike her doom, and history write *Britannia fuit*. And then, we shall see such an uprising of the Irish race as the world has never witnessed before," when those Irish exiles may return with a vengeance to visit England with "another Fontenoy." None of our people get frightened at the possible results of such outbursts of rhetoric. We know that the Irish are poetic and given to occasional dreaming, but we are sure that they are loyal and mean no harm. They can worship themselves and wait for the glorious future under their own vine and fig tree.

The Scotch are British in thought and in sentiment. They have no desire for change; they would not entertain the proposal. They sing "God Save the Queen" as bravely as they sing "Auld lang Syne." They do not talk of England, but of "Britain." They believe that Scotland is the mother of England, and of the greater portion of the civilized world. To separate from Britain would mean separation from Scotland; it would mean a political transformation into that peculiar thing which is neither fish nor flesh nor good red herring—a "Yankee." What have they to gain by the process? glory to their venerable traditions? more freedom for the exercise of their faith? a government of which they can be more proud? a fountain head of politics more clear and healthy? The answer is a simple *no*. For a people proud of their history, of their heroes and their saints; for a people who by nature and education incline to a constitutional Government, there is nothing inviting in the prospect of annexation to the United States.

For the English portion of the population a word will be sufficient;—they are not American in their tastes or proclivities. So that the question is narrowed to the mere matter of business relations. The ecclesiastical, social, and political leanings of the people are in the opposite direction; but the question is fairly raised: Are there not commercial reasons for annexation so powerful and convincing that all other arguments must yield to them?

It is true that a Zollverein—a method of dividing the year's customs duties between the two peoples—has been discussed as a thing that is feasible. The late Hon. John Young advocated this, and the policy has now the powerful support of Prof. Goldwin Smith. The thing in itself is simple enough. We are divided from the United States by a line on the maps which cannot possibly be guarded everywhere. While the tariffs differ there will be smuggling, and rivalry in trade. But the moment this Zollverein is tested the difficulty of adopting it is seen to be great, if not impossible.

A Zollverein between Canada and the United States would not be possible on the grounds that the Americans are *Yankees*. However good and estimable individual Americans may be, it is a fact that as a people they are not easily dealt with. In the matter of the Alabama case they put in monstrous claims, and got an absurd amount awarded to them—had a large surplus in their hands when all possible demands upon the Government had been liberally met, and put it into the Treasury. No other nation would have done that. In the matter of the Fisheries award the same temper is displayed; they challenged the decision; abused the arbitrators; charged their own representatives with weakness, if not actual dishonesty; and at last have hit upon something which looks like a reason for further parley. Perhaps it arises from the juvenility of the nation, or from the fact that they have not been brought much into contact with other nations; but there is the truth that the Americans have not—as a people—a nice sense of national honour where the interests, or supposed interests, of their great "Union" are concerned. They can understand drawing and draining, and holding—but the verb "to give" they are prepared to "decline," but not to practise.

Suppose a Zollverein established. Does any one doubt that even the first year would pass without difficulties occurring about the division of profits? The "Yankee" spirit would go into a state of melancholy if it once allowed a question of money to be settled without dispute or protest. And Canada, although a dwarf, would be in no way disposed to submit to the injustice of the "forty-million" power giant; for we are not a little proud of "this Canada of ours." We should dispute with our big brother, and decline to submit to injustice; so that a most unhealthy excitement would prevail on both sides of the line.

It might become a question as to which would weary of the conflict and yield first—the four millions or the forty millions; but that is to assume that