

The ignoble cant against "sentiment" has been brought to an anti climax by the appeal of the Boston, Halifax, and P. E. I. S. S. Line against the Canada Atlantic Line, on the score of the rates of freight. We are rather of opinion that there is a good deal of "sentiment" of pride in our city in the possession of a vessel so superior as the *Halifax*, and in the enterprise which set her afloat.

We are becoming a little surfeited with *Robt. Ellesmere*. It seems to us that the clergy are themselves to blame for the amount of attention that has been drawn to the book. It is not at all a more powerful work than one or two other agnostic productions that have been allowed to drop quietly out of notice. *Robt. Ellesmere* would have done the same if its sale had not been enhanced by the importance attached to it in the pulpit.

We are surprised to find Mr. Longley, in a grave and serious letter on a subject of immense importance, committing himself to the shallow, radical rant about State, Church and Hereditary Aristocracy,—things which can never possibly affect Canada, and are the inexcusable trap. Nor does the Attorney General strengthen any position he may hold by quoting Dr. Goldwin Smith, whose name is becoming as unsavory to true Canadians as that of the designing and self-seeking Mr. Wiman.

American women, of the notoriety-seeking type, have discovered a new method of advertising their vulgarity, which has the merit, to an unscrupulous person, of being quite simple and easy. It is only to invent a story that the Prince of Wales has taken some liberty with her. There is nothing that American papers and their credulous readers, agape for scandal, enjoy so much as an opportunity of bringing the Prince into unfavorable discussion, but all sensible people know that the Prince is a gentleman, and a man of strong common sense, and not a fool.

Mr. Longley published last week in the *Chronicle* a letter which he considered called for by opinions expressed that he was an annexationist. Mr. Longley's explanation of his position is marked by considerable clearness, and many of the principles he lays down are such as will not call forth much dissent. We notice, however, an inconsistency when in one place he admits that the British army and navy are "equipments whose very existence secured our rights without the horrors of war," and in another deprecates the possibility of Canada being dragged into a military system of which she "has no need."

We are bound to believe that a fact which is widely known to others has escaped Mr. Longley's cognizance. It is this, that the "alternatives" being forced on the country, an astute section of the disaffected has decided on the policy of advocating Independence. Independence once gained they will bend all their energies to convince Canada that she cannot stand alone, and to carry her over to their true love, the United States. They would be quite willing to put up with Independence for five years or so—after that Annexation. Let all loyal and true-hearted Canadians be warned against the advocacy of Independence, to which the *Globe* and other Liberal papers are veering round.

A person signing himself "Canadian" has been writing to the *Broad Arrow* "a splenetic epistle, abusive of the Minister of Militia, drawing a picture of 'discontent bordering on despair' against the administration of the Militia," so says the *Militia Gazette*. The writer seems to want a "responsible British-Canadian" as Minister. Such a letter is a mean advantage to take of an English paper, which is, of course, not posted as to the invidiousness of sectionalism, and the writer ought to be ashamed of himself. Sir Adolphe might, indeed, bestir himself a little more in some matters, but we in Canada are quite capable of working him or any other Minister up, without whining to an English paper, which is not cognizant of our militia conditions, a course which can do no possible good.

It is a trite saying that there are two sides to every question, but it is particularly true of the important question raised by Queensland, of the Colonies exercising an influence as to the appointment of their Governors. *Prima facie* the idea is attractive, but the Legislature of Victoria cheered the opinion of their Premier that things were best as they are. The nominee of a colony would be the nominee of the party in power, and, at all events, in the cases of the great Colonies, men of a high stamp and of unbiassed principles are almost always selected. There is great security in this against popular dissatisfaction. Perhaps there is a mean course which might work satisfactorily, viz: if the Imperial Government were to intimate to Colonial Legislatures their nominations in advance, with a view to ascertain their acceptability.

A good deal of very unprofitable discussion has been running through the partizan press about the action of Mr. Blake in accepting a brief for the C. P. R. Let it be said, once for all, that Mr. Blake has a perfect right to do as he has done. The only point is that his action stultifies the violent outcry of a portion of the Liberal press in the matter. Something of the same kind suggests itself in Mr. Blake's having read himself out of Imperial Federation. The *St. John Telegraph* would have attached undue importance to a forecast of the National situation, had Mr. Blake committed himself to one. We do not share this view. Mr. Blake's long opposition to the great National work of the C. P. R., his weakness on the Rice question, and his generally unfortunate statesmanship, have done so much to impair his prestige, that we can only look to his great abilities and his unquestionable integrity as a hope for the future, should occasion arise.

In an eloquent sermon, preached at Charlottetown on Thanksgiving day, the Rev. Mr. Carruthers enounced the following sound sentiments:—"Every loyal Canadian must feel that the worst tendency of our national life is that of the setting up of Province against Province. . . . Frown down the man who knows no love of country. . . . The country has no use for the man, be he Whig or Tory, who has no good word to say for his country, and is forever praising some other land." We are a good deal indebted at this crisis of our national life to the patriotic enunciations of the clergy of all denominations.

The *London Society Herald* takes this view of the animus of Prince Bismarck towards England:—"The personal intervention of Alexander II prevented Germany from invading France in 1875. Prince Bismarck's emissary, M. de Radowitz, failed to convince the Czar that the durable peace of Europe depended upon the dismemberment of France. Similar overtures made to the present Czar also fell to the ground. Nations, like business men, will not make a bargain without some consideration for it. Germany can offer Russia no adequate compensation for the disadvantages that would accrue to her by the creation of a stronger Germany and a weaker France, but, as the late M. Katkoff once pointed out to the Czar, the case would be different if England were substituted for France. It is upon this basis that an understanding has been arrived at between Germany and Russia. Prince Bismarck's thunderbolts never strike the same spot twice. In 1863 it was Denmark, in 1866 it was Austria, in 1870 it was France. Bismarck now wishes to consolidate the vast fabric of his fame by one crowning master-stroke. He hates England, and he has trained the Emperor and the German people to hate her and regard her as Germany's commercial enemy. Prince Bismarck is a man of imperious passion; his hatred is thorough going, and his personal animosities give zest to his political moves." If this be correct it is an unpleasant outlook, but England has more than one card to play. Probably her best policy would be to set to work at once to restore the old cordiality with Russia.

That excellent journal, the *Chicago Canadian American*, under the heading "What to Expect," gives to its countrymen at home the following significant warning. Comment is unnecessary:—"The election of Harrison has set Canadians speculating as to the attitude this country will assume with reference to the Dominion, after the Republican policy has been announced. Some of our neighbors think that Harrison will out-Herod Herod; others that the Republicans will prove real friends and extend a helping hand to Canadians. The people of the Dominion need not look for friends in the ranks of either party. Our public men, without regard to party, are all but committed to an anti-Canadian policy. They believe in conceding nothing to the Dominion; and a majority of them would support a movement for the annexation of Canada. They want United States ports on Hudson's Bay, on the lower St. Lawrence and on the Bay of Fundy, and they are ready to worry the Dominion into union. Canada has no friends at Washington. American statesmen are for the United States first, last, and all the time. They study the interests of no other nation. What they do is for the glory and gain of the American Republic. They regard Canada as an enemy in disguise; as a menace to this country; and nothing but the extinction of the political line will satisfy them. This is the truth, and it may hurt Canadians. But they should no longer live in a fool's paradise. They will get from this country only that which cannot possibly be withheld by the employment of the tricks of statecraft. That is all they will receive; all they need expect."

The point likely to raise the most opposition under the new Assessment Act, is the income tax. In England the revenue is largely derived from this source, and years of experience have reduced its mode of collection to such perfection that it is by no means an unpopular tax. Still the giving to municipalities the power to assess income, and to meddle more or less with the private business of residents, may be open to objections. In the case of a direct tax levied by the Provincial Government over the whole Province to augment its revenues, the assessments would be made on a broad and liberal basis, but municipal assessors, as a rule, are not the most intelligent of men, and, besides, are liable to sectional prejudices, and may use the powers given them under the Act in a manner to cause great discontent. In the United States the income tax proved so obnoxious that it was abolished as soon as possible, and the income tax just about going into effect in France is causing much dissatisfaction, and will doubtless lead to the overthrow of the present Government. In England the assessment is on the average income of three years, and this is simple justice, as it too often happens that merchants who make thousands in one year may lose money in the year following. Section 5 of the new Act, in defining income, says: "and shall include the interest arising, and directly or indirectly received from money at interest, securities, notes, mortgages, debentures, accounts, public stocks, debts due the rate-payer, and all other property, etc." Take one of these items, mortgages, and see how the tax upon them will operate. A farmer raises say \$1,000 on mortgage, and lays it out in improvements on his farm. The next year the assessors add the value of the improvements to his assessment, and he pays a tax on the borrowed money. They also assess the lender of the money, and in this way collect a double tax. This is unjust, and the tax on the interest arising from mortgages should certainly be abolished. If it is not, the farmer will eventually have to pay both taxes, as the money lender will be certain to stipulate that this tax shall be paid by the borrower. There are other points equally objectionable under the Act, to which we shall call attention, trusting that by timely action the Government may see its way to eliminate objectionable features at the next session of the Legislature.