

said: "The cost of all war should be borne by those for whose benefit it is carried on."

John Bright asserted, in his place in Parliament, that "there is no statesman in England who will venture to bring about the shedding of one drop of blood in defence of British North America."

Mr. Aytoun said: "He never had met with any man, not a member of the Government, who considered that it was possible to defend Canada against an attack in force by the United States."

Sir C. W. Dilke says: "We defend the Colonies only during peace; in war time they are ever left to shift for themselves." Mr. Cardwell: "It is an almost universally accepted principle of English policy that it is no longer desirable to maintain a standing army to defend our distant Colonies."

The *London Times* says: "We are quite aware that, in the event of war, we should not be able to render effectual aid to our Canadian Dominion, and that our fellow subjects out there would either have to fight at a terrible disadvantage, or mortify our pride by anticipating defeat and yielding to terms. In a national point of view that would be no loss to this country."

The Globe on Colonial Emancipation.—"We do not believe that the movement for separation from Great Britain has assumed importance, but it would be mere folly to deny that the introduction of the National Policy has given it new excuses. It was inevitable that independence and annexation should gain adherents when such arguments were used as those which brought about the Protectionist victory. Appeals to the sentiment of loyalty to the Mother Country were hooted at as unreasonable by those who asserted that material interest would be sacrificed by the continuance of a revenue tariff. A feeling of hostility to England was engendered in the minds of those who were stung by the Tory taunt, that Canadians were "mere hewers of wood and drawers of water" to the