

has not, up to this moment, favoured the public with the full text of that address, but it may be presumed that the reporter's notes are carefully stored up, and that it will appear, with a critical and exegetical commentary, before many days. It is now some years since Mr. Brown declared that the relations between England and Canada were anomalous, and must, before long, be readjusted upon a sounder and more enduring basis. His journal, to judge from some recent articles, is disposed on the whole to favour the plan of Federation, if only workable machinery can be devised for its practical operation. It is quite certain that if a *plebiscite*, though we by no means desire it, could be taken, a vast majority of Canadians, and we believe of Australian, South African, and West Indian colonists would record their votes promptly in favour of a closer union with the mother-country. It is all very well to sneer at Canadian loyalty as something merely sentimental—a phrase always on the lips of those who have no emotions, and are innocently unconscious of their potency in determining the future of nations as well as individuals. But the allegation is simply untrue. Sentiment may do much, but the loyalty of Canadians rests on a deep-seated conviction that their material progress, and all that makes for their advancement as a nation, are bound up in British connection, and that these would receive an incalculable impetus from a closer relationship with England. Our position to the north of the great American Republic gives the subject peculiar interest to all who look forward and endeavour to forecast the future. Three eventual destinies lie before us, and in the ultimate analysis only two. Independence, with our geographical contiguity with the United States, could only mean final absorption into the Union; and annexation is perhaps more distasteful to the people of Canada than any prospect the speculative politician could possibly hold out to them. Perhaps those in England whose insular pride and prejudices lead them to make light of the Colonies, and to talk gaily as well as glibly about the coming separation, would pause if they could peer far enough into the future to see the American Union stretching from the Arctic Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico, and perhaps to the shores of Guiana, its alliances courted by

England's enemies in Europe, and itself, in all but the name, a European power, ambitious as Russia, fickle and restless as France, and warily self-seeking like Germany.

With such a power, under its existing form of government, and with its unpalatable code of commercial and social morality, and its ways and manners altogether, Canada desires no closer alliance than that of friendly intercourse in trade, and in the ordinary, pleasant way of good neighbouring. She has a cordial liking for her cousin Jonathan, and even relishes his amusing swagger and grandiloquence; but amity, not matrimony must be the end of all. In the October number of *The Nineteenth Century*, Lord Blachford publishes a criticism on Sir Julius Vogel's article which was reprinted in the September issue of the *CANADIAN MONTHLY*. Lord Blachford, better known as Sir Frederic Rogers, Mr. Gladstone's Permanent Under-Secretary for the Colonies, is an able writer, and, from his former official position, fully conversant with Britain's possessions over the sea. Unfortunately, however, that position has not been wholly an advantage to one who proposes to treat of 'The Integrity of the British Empire.' He invariably takes the Downing-street view of matters—the parish or vestry view, as it has been called—and still more unfortunately, he adheres religiously to the traditions of a political school whose maxims England has almost completely discarded. His Lordship fully admits Sir Julius Vogel's alternative. 'As the colonies develop,' he says (p. 369), 'they must either become separate nations or they must have a share—eventually the greater share—in the government of the British Confederacy.' There can be no mistake, therefore, about Canada's destiny: for, as she could not maintain her independence any longer than the forbearance of her neighbours permitted it to continue, the alternative with us is, Federation or Annexation. The words in parenthesis, 'eventually the greater share,' furnish the key to Lord Blachford's hostility to any plan of federal union; he is afraid that England would be 'swamped,' as Sir Julius says, in her own Parliament. Supposing representation to be based simply on population, this would, no doubt, eventually occur; but when and where did England ever so construct a representative system? Lon-