

A MINISTER in Cleveland said in his anniversary sermon to his flock :—

"In respect of labour I might have done more for you, perhaps, and those outside, certainly, if I had been content to burn the candle at both ends. But I never considered suicide a Christian grace, and, the Lord helping me, I never mean to kill myself before my time by work beyond my conscious strength."

That Minister in Cleveland is worthy of much commendation, for the general notion seems to be that a minister belongs to his flock body and soul, night and day, and at all other times when they require him. Some ministers announce from the pulpit where they are going to visit in the week, and others give a report of the number of families they have called upon. It will come by and by that the main qualifications for the ministry will be, a good walker, and a good social talker. The Cleveland clergyman will not "burn the candle at both ends," by which, I expect, he means that he will not keep up a constant strain upon his boots and his brains. Which end he uses, I don't know, but boots are popular now-a-days.

LORD MORTON writes in a very sensible way in the *Nineteenth Century* on "How *not* to retain our colonies," in answer to Earl Grey's article on "How to retain our colonies." Lord Morton comes to the general conclusion that the way to retain colonies is "by calling upon them to complete the terms and conditions of fellow-citizenship with ourselves, rather than by giving them home advice and patronage, or by increasing Imperial control." This is certainly sound judgment, for it has been demonstrated that a merely commercial relation cannot be made binding and strong. On the other hand, "the moral and social tie" might be drawn very tight, and kept so—for, at any rate in Canada, we are "ready to fight as well as fatten," and if England wants a Canadian regiment to teach Cetewayo better manners, it could be raised in a brief period. But when Lord Morton throws upon us the duty and cost of our own *naval* and *military* defense we can only ask what he means?

CANADA can provide *naval* and *military* defence against all possible packs of Fenians, but if such an unlikely thing should happen as a war between England and the United States; or, if the still more unlikely thing should happen—an attempt by the United States to annex Canada—how could we find either men or money to defend the border line? The truth is that this adjustment of the burdens and privileges of freedom in the Colonies is becoming more and more difficult. The Colonies have made up their minds that they must be allowed to adopt whatever commercial policy they please, without let or hindrance from the Home Government; and the British are beginning to think that if they cannot have the privilege of open Colonial markets, they ought not to have the burden of Colonial defence. He will be a wise man, and a friend to Great Britain and her Colonies, who shall find a way of binding the Colonies to the Empire without there being so much as a suspicion of coercion or patronage.

THE *Pall Mall Budget* is not so generous as the *World*, from which I quoted last week. Surely the Free-traders of England have a chance, by returning good for evil, to teach Canadian protectionist transgressors the evil of their ways. It is hardly consistent, to say the least of it, that advocates of Free-trade should recommend reciprocity in such a way as this from the *Budget* :—

"The resolution which was quoted last week by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach as having been passed by the Assembly of the Dominion of Canada brings forward once more the question of the Pacific Railway across British North America. When Canada entered into an agreement to construct this railroad she manifestly overtaxed her strength. This was done in the days of railroad inflation, when to build a railroad was necessarily to ensure wealth and prosperity for the country through which it was carried. Recent events in the United States and elsewhere have shown conclusively that this investment of capital is by no means invariably advantageous. Canadian railroads themselves have been, as a whole, disastrous speculations for English investors. Desirable, therefore, as it may be, and is, to keep good faith with British Columbia, the Imperial Government will probably view with no great favour the 'best efforts' of Canada to obtain 'further aid by guarantee or otherwise in the construction of this great national work.' If, indeed, Canada would give up her Protectionist policy against this country, and surrender back some fair proportion of the waste-lands now given up entirely to her management 'for the purpose of

extending relief to the unemployed working classes of Great Britain and affording them permanent homes on British soil,' then possibly some fresh arrangements might be come to. But it certainly does seem rather strange that a colony which is enacting more stringent measures of exclusion against English manufactures should come here to ask as a favour for English money or money's worth."

PUBLIC opinion in England must be in a peculiar condition, or this general outcry against Lieut. Carey would never have been heard. Before any of the facts of the case were known the Earl of Beaconsfield rose in the House of Lords and declared that the life of Prince Louis Napoleon had been "cruelly and needlessly sacrificed." The Press took up the cry and bespattered the English officer from head to foot. But from all the evidence given at the Court-martial by the men forming the reconnoitring party, it is evident that with inexcusable haste the Earl of Beaconsfield "cruelly and needlessly" attacked the character of a man who had not been heard in his own defence. Nothing that the Earl could do in such a case would surprise me, for it served to engage public opinion for a few days so as to draw off attention from Ministerial blundering; but that the people should have indulged in such wild and unreasoning abuse of Carey is inexplicable.

THE talk about the Prince Imperial as being a *guest* of the British army is absurd; he was simply a privileged spectator of the war. The Prince Imperial was in command of the party, and not Lieut. Carey, and as the officer in charge he had given the order to retreat. It is quite possible that the lieutenant lost his head when the Zulus broke upon them, but to brand him with cowardice because he did not court certain death when it was his duty to escape is worse than cruel. Has the Earl of Beaconsfield killed the English love of fair play? It looks like it.

THERE are other matters connected with the unfortunate death of the Prince Imperial which should be explained. First of all, how came the Prince to be in command of the party of reconnoissance sent out to choose a camping ground for a large portion of the British army? When he applied for leave to take an active part in the campaign against the Zulus it was denied him, but he was permitted to go as a favoured spectator. And yet in a short time he is allowed to undertake a dangerous but important task. The officer who gave him that task, and only nine troopers and a lieutenant to support him, should be court-martialed instead of Carey.

AND then, what sort of horses can they have in the British army now-a-days? From the report given by the troopers every horse bolted at the sound of firing. What is the good of a troop horse that will not stand the crack of a rifle? But everything seems to be in a sad mess out at the Cape.

I AM glad, however, to find the *Globe* retracting from the position it took last week with regard to Lieut. Carey. Then it accused him of the worst kind of cowardice, and heaped unqualified abuse upon his head; but on further evidence and reflection it says :—

"It was plainly his (the Prince's) own inconsiderate rashness that took him, the two troopers, and the Kaffir who died with him, to their deaths. There is not a word in the evidence so far published justifying a belief that he could have been saved had the remaining five of his comrades laid down their lives along with the lives of the three who died. There is nothing to show that if the lieutenant and the troopers had made a minute's stand the whole party would not have been annihilated, just as other bodies that have been surprised in the same war have been."

THAT is sound common sense; but it would have been a little more graceful if the *Globe* had formally withdrawn the remarks it made a week ago when discussing the same matter. Then it said :—

"A rally of five seconds' duration would have enabled the Prince to mount, but the troopers and their officer seem to have been lost to every sense of what was due to a comrade, though in this case the comrade was a guest." If the *Globe* has changed its opinion of Mr. Carey's conduct it should at least own to having said things untrue and uncalled for. I expected to see indignant protests from Englishmen, but they have not appeared in the daily papers. It must be that they exhausted their stores of wrath on the *SPECTATOR* when the Isandula business was properly called "a panic."

EDITOR.