

guage and customs, and far removed by distance, is in "the strictest sense an integral portion of the Empire," and as a proof thereof volunteers information that it contributes to the Military defence of the Mother Country. If so, how is it that the Abyssinia campaign has cost Great Britain £3,000,000 sterling?

Not only is India no portion of the Empire but it is its weakest and most vulnerable dependency. With a population ever ready to throw off the yoke of the handful of military intruders who hold them, by force of arms, in subjection, it needs nothing but some able and intelligent native leader to take advantage of Russian assistance to shake India free for ever from British domination, and that is a consummation more like to arrive than John Bright's millenium of universal peace at any price. So much for military strength and the application of Sir Charles Adderley's theorem illustrates the value of the policy pursued by the party of disintegration.

The *Review* classifies the dependencies of the Empire thus: Military Posts, Mercantile Stations, the Sugar Islands, and lastly the great Colonial Empires of Canada and Australia. And it should be recollected that the whole question of the relations of those Colonies to Great Britain has been raised on the outlay of £1,000,000 sterling per annum for the maintenance of naval and military forces requisite for the protection of British interests in the great Colonies and the preservation of the Sugar Islands and the trading stations—the purely military positions alone costing at least double that sum.

The *Edinburgh Review* makes its next point of the fact that none of the Colonies have furnished a revenue to the Mother Country—that is undoubtedly true, but it should be fairly stated that these dependencies when providing for their own local government had fulfilled all necessary obligations—because the expense of the Home Government has been incurred in the protection of home interests principally; of the £69,000,000 per annum of revenue raised in Great Britain, one million sterling is paid for the maintenance of troops and naval squadrons at or near the great Colonial dependencies—now the whole of that money is paid by 30,000,000 people—our proportion in Canada as one-fifth of that population would be £13,800,000, and for what reason could we be asked for such a sum?—would it be as an equivalent for our share of the outlay which is computed at most as equaling £200,000 per annum? or like our Yankee neighbors do the Whigs want for payment for English countenance and sympathy? The argument as applied to the advantage Great Britain derives from the Colonies is absurd. It is untrue that the wars which created the National Debt were caused by the Colonies—these wars were undertaken to establish Britain's Naval Supremacy—the foundation of all or nearly all the Colonies were the consequences of the suc-

cess of that policy, and their increase have tended and will tend to make England the arbitress of the world's policy as well as to perpetuate lasting peace for very obvious reasons.

The *Review* further attempts to strengthen Sir Charles Adderley's theories by another assertion which shows great want of knowledge on the part of the writer, and shows the fallacious illustration of those principles of political economy under which the Whigs and Radicals have been and are still laboring—if there is not a purpose to serve hidden underneath the drapery. "Nay, to such a point has this commercial independence of the Colonies been carried that the Imperial Government has allowed them in direct opposition to its own principles to establish and levy restrictive duties on British produce and manufactures; and the doctrine of protection exploded and abandoned at home finds advocates in the democratic assemblies of Ottawa and Melbourne. In this respect the relations of England to her own Colonial possessions are less favorable to ourselves than the relations with foreign countries where they are regulated by treaty." It would be hard to cram into any other publication such a tissue of misrepresentation in the same number of lines. In Ottawa free trade has long been the policy of Parliament which is not as democratic in any sense of the term as the Whigs and Radicals have made the Imperial Parliament. Here we have a property qualification for members, which taken at the relative wealth of the two countries would be equivalent to £2000 per ann., we have also a similar qualification for voters equal on the same grounds to the old £50 franchise in England; we did elect our Mayors and Legislative Councillors, that is, the members of our Upper House; but as we live close by a Republic, and a model one at that, we happen to entertain a strong dislike to institutions so ardently admired by Gladstone, Bright and their supporters, so we took a step backward with the full consent of the people, and now our Mayors are elected by the Aldermen, and our Upper House nominated by the Crown—so much for democracy. As to the restrictive duties there are none put on English manufactured goods or produce in Canada, what is levied being merely customs duties paid by the consumers—in this case the Canadian people; but there are prohibitive duties placed on British manufactures by the United States—and it might be a wise study for Whig philosophers to define what would be the condition of British commerce if Canada was forced in self defence to adopt a similar policy?

It is not necessary to discuss this question further, the loss of the Colonies would hurt the English people with the maintenance of such a naval force that even their resources would fail under the pressure, and they would rapidly sink to the condition of Holland. The vast population of the British Isles, shut up in a circumscribed area with

declining industries would demand and have a re-distribution of the landed property which would be followed by a similar re-distribution of national wealth ushering in John Stuart Mills millenium—which the Radicals have inaugurated by the confiscation of the property of the Irish church, to be followed by that of the landed properties for the benefit of the Fenians. But we are not so much struck with the wisdom of the plan or success of its operations so far as to be willing to copy any portion thereof.

The theory of Colonial connection as defined by the ex-under Secretary of State and adopted by the *Edinburgh Review*, is not based on facts—and therefore worthless.

An acrimonious personal controversy, has occupied some of our city journals for the past week or so. It is based on the public acts of one of our most esteemed and influential citizens, the Hon. James Skead, a gentleman whose character has always stood deservedly high in the estimation of the people, but whose sense of duty compelled him to bring certain charges against a gentleman in the employment of the Department of Public Works. Now, all this related to matters in which the country at large was interested, it was perfectly fair to have it discussed in all its bearings, but unhappily personalities entirely foreign to the question at issue has been dragged into the controversy without in the slightest degree serving the interests of the public, who have nothing to do with matters as they are now manipulated. It surely is not conducive to morality, good feeling, or the proper regard for the interests of the country, which every journal should make its first consideration; to allow its columns to become the vehicle of indiscriminate attacks on the private affairs of any individual no matter what his position may be. A public man should be judged by his public acts, and the whole of this question belongs to the public without reference to the private affairs of the parties concerned. It is neither right nor conducive to the political morality of the country to trail the characters of its public men in the mire, and the sooner the controversy is reduced to its original dimensions the better for all parties concerned.

SIR A. T. GALT has awoke to the unpleasant consciousness that the role of a political weather cock is not always the safest or surest mode of reaching a ministerial port folio; the opposition, greatly to their honor, has repudiated him; however well inclined the present parties in power could have nothing to say to him, and the people are astounded at his consummate impudence in bringing before Parliament a question calculated to do incalculable injury to the foreign relations of Canada. The game he has played is that of Consul General Potter, and what he attempted in his memorable embassy to Washington—an effort to force Canada into