

of a Canadian diplomatic and consular service is a bar to independence, in unadulterated nonsense." So far the *Globe*. We may add that, under arrangements involving but a minimum of expense, Great Britain would, no doubt, cheerfully permit the interests of Canadians on the continent of Europe to be confided to her own consular agents, the chances being very small that such a charge would ever be a troublesome one.

As regards army and navy, our present organizations would not require to be increased beyond, in the Militia, that slow augmentation of the permanent corps which is now going on by very gradual degrees, and undoubtedly ought to go on till there are either schools established convenient of access from all parts of the Dominion for each arm of the service, or, in accordance with a recent proposition which has much force in it, until a sufficient force of each arm for purposes of instruction can be attached to the existing schools. The present strength of the regular corps, horse, foot and artillery, is only 9,400; an addition of, say 300 men, would do all that could possibly be required for the next twenty years.

The fisheries question once settled, there would be nothing to make it necessary for Canada to maintain a naval force much larger than she does at present. Half a dozen cruisers—somewhat more efficient vessels than those now employed—would be sufficient. If we cannot exist beside the United States without a powerful army and navy, how is it that Mexico and the weak states of Central America are permitted to do so? It is said that the quarrels of relations are more bitter than those of strangers, and there is a danger in the mania of unworthy envy and uncharitableness which has seized on the "baser sort" of Americans, but there are also temptations in the South, such as the absolute possession of the territory through which the canal must pass, which shall eventually relegate Cape Horn to a "terra incognita."

"Algoma," the *Globe* goes on to criticise, "says that Annexation would mean for England and the United States perpetual amity. So would Canadian Independence. It would leave England free to occupy her true position in Europe. So would Independence." "Algoma" waxes very in consequence as he goes on, and gives a number of results of annexation which are of no force whatever, and are shown up by the *Globe* accordingly. The most forcible of them is the abolition of the frontier Custom houses, "but if," says the *Globe*, "we can obtain continental Free Trade without Annexation, as we believe we can," all the advantages supposed to inhere in annexation would be gained without disturbance of our own Federal institutions, which we entirely agree with the *Globe* in "believing to be better than those of the States, less cumbersome, safer and better worth paying for, to say nothing of the ignominy of giving them up solely to escape the dignity and responsibility of managing our own affairs."

We shall, from time to time resume this subject, meanwhile, we are of opinion that the *Globe* deserves the thanks of all true Canadians for its belief in Canada, and for setting forth its faith in unmistakable terms. Everyone ought to read the correspondence on the future of our country which it is now publishing.

RAISING THE STANDARD.

Progress (St. John) in its issue of 20th Oct., noticing the few lines in which we adverted to the fourth Anniversary of THE CRITIC, congratulates us on our success. In these few lines we happened to say—"Our efforts not to lower the standard of the Press of Nova Scotia have been rewarded," etc. Our enterprising contemporary remarked on these simple words—"Instead of striving 'now (sic) to lower' it should try to raise the standard," etc. Of course the word "now" is a misprint.

We thank *Progress* for its friendliness with all sincerity, but when the fashion of what we "should" do is prescribed to us after a manner which does not commend itself to our judgment, we are under the necessity of saying that we are the best judge of our own business. In order to make this clear to our contemporary, it would appear to be necessary to explain that, if we had said "our efforts to raise," instead of "our efforts not to lower," we should have thought ourselves guilty of a presumption which we are far from feeling, and which, even had we been conceited enough to feel, it would have been a gross impertinence to express.

Progress continues:—"THE CRITIC occupies a field somewhat similar to *Progress*. The fact that in four years its circulation has touched 5,000, while *Progress*, though not six months old, has as large a constituency, shows that Nova Scotians are not as appreciative of a good thing as New Brunswickers. Beyond that the standard of New Brunswick newspapers is higher than that of Nova Scotia."

We are glad that our allusion (which was almost a chance mention, as it had nearly slipped our memory altogether) to THE CRITIC's birthday has been the means of affording our contemporary an opportunity of acquainting the public with his own far more rapid success; but if—to revert to our first point—"the standard of New Brunswick newspapers is," as *Progress* avers, "higher than that of Nova Scotia," it is, no doubt, this fact which makes it difficult to *Progress* to comprehend that THE CRITIC is precluded by self-respect from an offensive vaunt which might at any moment be justly challenged.

ENGLAND AND HER COLONIES.

The indifference shown a few years ago by English politicians, and echoed by a large portion of the English Press, as to the retention and support of the Colonies, went very near to attain the end of separation. That indifference is a thing of the past. England is now aroused to a thorough appreciation of their vast importance, and that by no means on what some people delight to call "sentimental" grounds. Lord Roseberry, addressing the Leeds Chamber of Commerce recently, has attempted to show the

business community of Great Britain the value to her of her Colonies, and the risks she runs of losing them. The late Foreign Secretary is, as we all know, an ardent Imperial Federationist, and perhaps no living statesman is better worth listening to on such topics. Lord Roseberry adduced, in the course of his speech, many facts which must have appealed to his audience as of high value and significance. He appears to have deprecated a view of the Colonial connection sometimes taken in England, though less prevalent than a few years since, that all the Colonies wanted from the Mother Country was to borrow British capital at as cheap a rate as they could, and burthen her with the cost of their coast defences, giving her in return the sort of shadowy allegiance represented by acceptance of a Governor nominated by the Crown. The sting of this reproach, whatever amount of truth it may have contained, has been modified to a considerable extent, in the case of Australia by the agreement lately entered into by which the great Southern Colonies concede a substantial aid to the Imperial squadron in their waters, and, it should be considered, in the case of Canada by the construction of the C. P. R., though this latter should not be allowed to blind us to the fact that, if we desire to maintain our Home Connection on honorable terms, some such compact as that entered into by the Australian Dependencies is incumbent on our self-respect.

Some of the facts stated, however, are considered in England sufficiently startling to convince the most sceptical that the price paid by her for the allegiance of the Colonies is by no means too large.

Lord Roseberry reminded his hearers that, while the United States took from Great Britain during the last ten years an average of £24,350,000 of her produce, which, for a population of nearly 60,000,000, is at the rate of only eight shillings sterling per head, Canada, with but 5,000,000 has taken for the same period an average of £7,300,000, or nearly 30 shillings per head. It was pointed out that of course the hostile tariff of the United States accounts for much of this difference, but that, if Canada were to cast off her allegiance, she would be certain to adopt the tariff of her great neighbor, and English exports would fall off in proportion. This prediction might of course be falsified, as, whatever may occur, it is more than probable that the endeavors of Canada in the future will be in the direction of removing the restrictions of a high tariff so far as may from time to time be found feasible. We are, to a great extent, driven to a system of high duties by the United States' protective, and if Mr. Cleveland is re-elected the tariff reforms, which may be expected, will, no doubt, have an influence on Canada that cannot as yet be accurately estimated.

Australia is instanced by Lord Roseberry as a striking case in point. She takes from England on an average about 24½ millions, or about the same as the whole of the United States, though her population is only about 3½ millions, or at the rate of £7 per head, being seventeen times more in proportion than the United States, with its population of 60,000,000. It is further remarked that the loss of Canada and Australia would probably involve that of the smaller Colonies adjacent to them.

The case of Australia does not, of course, illustrate that of Canada, but it is evident that, even as things stand now, the upholding of the Colonies is a matter of such vital importance to Great Britain that the elaborated opinion of Sir Richard Cartwright, in his recent speech at Ingersoll, Ont., that she will take no "very active part" in the defence or protection of Canada, entirely lacks the sanction of the hard facts of commerce.

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT'S SPEECH.

The Liberal party affects to consider the speech of Sir Richard Cartwright, at Ingersoll, as a very important and a very able exposition. Without in the least wishing to disparage it, we must confess we do not see very much in it. In the first place, we cannot think Sir Richard justified in his assumption that the policy pursued by the Dominion Government has been of a nature willfully to irritate the United States, if the United States had allowed any sense of the just rights of her neighbor to influence her policy. In fact, Sir Richard's speech deals chiefly in assumptions, one of which is that to which we have alluded in another article, as to the attitude of Great Britain in any controversy with the States respecting Canada.

Sir Richard's panacea for all the ills to which he considers Canada is heir, is "such a mode of insuring free intercourse with the United States as is found in the resolution submitted to the Parliament of Canada by the Reform Party last session." "Such," he says, "is the method we propose"; and Sir Richard considers that this "method" can be carried out "without any sacrifice of our independence or legislative power." This would be all very well, but that there remains the simple but stubborn and ugly fact that the United States will listen to no overtures which do not tend to actual annexation. How does Sir Richard propose to get over this? He professes in one part of his speech "to have disposed of it already," but we utterly fail to discover any such disposition.

This "method," Sir Richard acknowledges, "would result in our having to raise our taxes in a different way." * * * * "A certain portion of the customs taxes would lapse." This can scarcely point in any direction but that of direct taxation, and we are not disposed to quarrel with Sir Richard on that point. We, as we have frequently said, believe that direct taxation, for sound reasons, would be one of the greatest blessings any party could persuade the country to adopt, and we could wish the Liberal party could see their way to take it boldly up; but we have no hope that they would be supported by a people as yet unable to see the hold they would have on the purse strings.

Sir Richard Cartwright is an able man, but the fact is, the circumstances of the moment do not admit of the formulation of a definite opposition policy, and every opposition orator finds himself driven to talk round his subject in language of that nebular grandeur ascribed by Macaulay to Mr. Gladstone.