lett

me

adr

rea

val

Th

wa

W

Co

sta

on

por

Go

po

ap

ab

in

 \mathbf{C}

is

R.

w]

L

th

er

th

 \mathbf{b}

SC

fin

co

le

W

 $\mathbf{s}_{\mathbf{j}}$

E

The answer to this has been the assertion that there is no disposition to loosen the ties that bind us to the Empire, and that the present policy has been necessary in order to teach us selfreliance. This statement is negatived by facts, and facts speak more strongly than words. Canadians do not object to the withdrawal of the troops, but to the spirit in which this measure was adopted. That we did not need such a stimulus to do our duty to the Empire and to ourselves, is proved by the fact, that before the troops were withdrawn, and at a time when such a step was disavowed, Nova Scotia, at the suggestion of its Adjutant-General, Colonel Sinclair, adopted a modification of the Prussian system. In 1866, out of a population of 360,000, over 40,000 went through battalion drill, or one-ninth of the whole population were trained to arms. similar spirit and system here would create a force in Great Britain of four millions of soldiers.

But even if it were true that we needed a spur to urge us to do our duty to our country, was it necessary to remove not only every soldier, but also even the symbol of English rule, the British flag? Was it decent, even if justifiable, to have a grand auction of the military stores and munitions of war in our fortresses advertised for the benefit of Yankees and Fenians in the New York Herald, among its list of bankrupt sales: "To be sold at a bargain, for whatever it will bring, all the stock-in-trade of a great nation that is returning to Europe, and is retiring from the business of supremacy"?

This spiritless policy was a few years ago appropriately inaugurated by speeches in Parliament and elsewhere, which created wide-spread fears and a feeling of irritation throughout the Colonies, which this bankrupt sale, and the recent surrender of the navigation of the St. Lawrence, as well as almost every act of the British Government where our rights have conflicted with the claims of the Americans, have tended to confirm.

To negligence or indifference may be attributed some, at least, of the remarkable features in the history of British diplomacy in our affairs. A recent writer in the *Times* has described in an amusing