

The usual amount of misrepresentation, coming through American sources, has been going the rounds of the press with regard to the Prince of Wales and the Hon. Artillery Company. It would be a new thing for the Prince of Wales to make a serious error where tact and discretion are required, and it appears that he has not done so in this case. It is now said that the reforms in the corps urged by the Prince were emphatically called for. It is much to be regretted that much of our European news comes to us distorted by the medium of the American press through which it passes.

Except for the respectable virtue of economy, we are not much in the way of hearing praises of the Duke of Edinburgh, but English papers have recently discovered that H. R. H. has developed into a very efficient Admiral. His handling of the fleet at sea is said to be remarked upon as second only to that of Sir Geoffrey Hornby, whose skill is conspicuous, while his steadiness and firmness, tempered with what may be termed "approachableness," are said to have produced the best effect on the order and discipline of the great Mediterranean Squadron, of which he will shortly relinquish the command.

Mr. Gladstone, writing in the *Youth's Companion*, says:—"Will the uprising nations, which are still dependencies of the British Crown, continue for another century to own its supremacy? My answer is simply this:—I hope they may; I know of no reason why they should not; why the elastic relations which now happily subsist should not continue to find room and verge enough for including and adjusting such novelties as may arise. It is true that some great war might stir up a new class of difficulties, but I do not despair of finding the resources of civilization to be sufficient for solving them. In the recent history of colonial relations centripetal has been stronger than centrifugal force, and the vague possibilities of separation have thus far been dwindling, and not growing, with the lapse of time."

Among other matters in which a number of Americans consider the United States would be advantaged by the absorption of Canada, the *New York Sun*, with a charming candor, thinks she would be a convenient cat's paw in overbalancing the South. This is how the *Sun* expatiates on the subject:—"Another blessing would come, though, from such a union, or the advantage of this country wholly. That would be the final and complete numerical overwhelming of the solid South, in the sense in which that term is understood, and the normal, healthy, and rational development to the South's local disagreements in politics." The overwhelming of the South may be a desideratum to a large section of the North, but, like most other American questions, has not a particle of interest for Canada.

"The Americans, as a rule," it is remarked in *The Colonies and India*, "are regarded as a very practical people, but we fear they will soon be losing this reputation if some of their papers continue the stupid talk about the annexation of Canada." Incidentally the same paper says:—"The United States represent a nationality without a name. What can you call them? The term 'Yankee' only applies to a portion of the 'Down-Easters,' and the term American signifies nothing, as it is common to the whole of the continent! This annexation cry is really a great compliment to Canada. It is not long ago since Americans spoke of the Dominion as a 'one-horse place,' and turned up their noses and shrugged their shoulders at it. They seem to have discovered now that it is something worth having, and that it is to be despised no longer. It is certain, however, that what the Canadians have they mean to keep, and that they will work out their destiny in their own way, and under the old flag which has waved above them for more than a hundred years."

The I. C. R. has issued a large and handsome calendar, adorned with a picture of Halifax, below which, in the centre, is the complicated and variegated coat of arms of Canada, with the Canadian ensign on one side, and what people seem to suppose is the representative flag of Great Britain on the other. Of course the red ensign is a national flag, but it is not the national flag. Neither is the white ensign, or the blue. The white is the ensign of the Royal Navy; the red belongs to the Merchant Service; the blue is now a rather special ensign, the wearing of which is limited. Men-of-war used to wear all three, according to the color of the Admiral's flag, but some years ago the useless complication was abolished, and the white flag and ensign with the red St George's Cross became the only flags worn by the Navy. The real national flag is the Union Jack without a border. The Jack with a white border is the merchant jack, and also, hoisted at the fore, the signal for a pilot. The union jack at the main, by the way, is the flag of an Admiral of the Fleet, which has probably been hoisted, for the first time for over half a century, by Lord John Hay, Commander-in-Chief at Plymouth, who has just been promoted to that rank.

The *Herald* (Jan 2nd) publishes at full length another of the "schemes" for "unrestricted reciprocity," which, notwithstanding some speciousness, amounts to a commercial vassalage which would, as is no doubt intended, lead to annexation. In connection with this sort of thing the *Toronto World* has the following pertinent remarks which are, in the main, true enough, except the statement in italics. We shall most decidedly not "come down to annexation at last":—"In the United States there are many ambitious politicians who are constantly seeking to perform a brilliant stroke, both for their own personal fame and for the advantage of the party with which they are identified. To annex Canada to the United States seems the most brilliant act within present possibilities, and men like Sherman, Blaine and

Butterworth, and journals like the *New York World*, *Sun*, *Herald*, *Tribune*, are all intent on this end. Among other active spirits in the States working at this problem is Erastus Wiman, also fired by the ambition to do something brilliant. On the Canadian side we have the sore-headed disappointed politicians and journalists who grabbed the Wiman fad in their despair; on the United States side we have the bright, hopeful, ambitious statesmen who are casting about them for a chance to distinguish themselves and their party. On one side we have despair, on the other patriotism. Our men are trying to wipe their country from off the face of the earth, and to obliterate forever Canadian nationality; the men on the other side are trying to build up and extend the United States. These despairist Canadians pretend that they are not working for the same thing that these bold, outspoken United States are. But they are Commercial Union, Political Union, Union, Annexation. Such are the steps, these Canadians starting at one end, the Yankees at the other. *The Canadians will come down to the straight level of annexation at last.* These commercial unionists and unrestricted reciprocitarians have a perfect understanding with the annexationists of the States. They are all working for the same end. If together they once induce the two nations to make a deal, which side do you think would settle the nature of the transaction, the sixty millions or the five?"

The population of Australia may now be fairly estimated at 3,000,000. The figures given by Whitaker are, in round numbers, as follows, but none of the returns are later than 31st Dec., 1887, and Victoria is estimated up to June of that year only:—

New South Wales.....	1,043,000
Victoria.....	1,019,000
Queensland.....	367,000
South Australia.....	318,000
Tasmania.....	143,000
West Australia.....	42,000

Total..... 2,932,000

And both Victoria and West Australia are known to have increased at a rapid rate during the past year. New Zealand, at the end of 1887 had a population of 603,000, but owing to a season of depression, is reported to have actually decreased some 9,400 since then. Such an unusual state of things cannot, however, be anything but temporary.

Senator Blair is out for war, straight, and there is a certain grasp and foresight in his arguments which have the strength of the courage of convictions. If Mr. Blair is brutal he does not, at all events, attempt to disguise his aims under any specious pretexts whatever. We rather admire the coolness of the following extract from a recent speech of this blood-thirsty Senator:—"We can settle this better now than our children can, and it is wrong to pass over to coming generations any increasing inheritance of bloodshed and difficulty growing out of a problem which, if it must be solved by violence, notwithstanding our solicitation for a peaceful ending, should be solved by ourselves. It is not fair to evade a responsibility so plainly cast upon us by Providence and thrust it upon our children. Political union between the United States and Canada may be looked upon as an accomplished fact. Some formalities remain to be complied with, and these formalities may even involve more or less violence, but until you can rend the continent asunder from Maine to Puget Sound, you cannot destroy the rapidly augmenting fusion now so fast ripening in the hearts of the Canadians and the people of the United States." It is not probable that the tail-twisters will do much harm at present, but it is not impossible that persistent brutality may create a permanent sentiment among the mass of brutal swaggerers to whom it directly appeals.

"The Provinces are dependencies of the Crown, and cannot be brought into the Union without their consent and the acquiescence of England. Commercial union is not openly favored by either of the main parties in the Dominion, but is advocated chiefly by a small contingent of Canadian Mugwumps, and its envoy-extraordinary residing in New York, Mr. Wiman. Annexation is scouted by all factions as an impracticable policy. There is unquestionably a feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction with existing institutions and relations, and it pervades all classes of Canadian society; but there is nothing like an organized movement in favor either of commercial union or annexation. Until there be such a movement, the American Government should refrain from officiously meddling in Canadian concerns. At the same time Senator Sherman has given to the American press the cue to be followed whenever these matters are discussed. Political union is the wages of commercial union. The Provinces can not expect to enjoy unrestricted privileges of trade with the United States without severing the political ties that connect them with Great Britain, and entering the Union as sovereign States. On those terms they will be welcomed, and will be allowed a full measure of home rule. On any other terms commercial union is not to be considered a practical question." The above utterance of the *N. Y. Tribune* is well worth attention. It is, at all events, in better tone and taste than that of the *Chicago Times*, which thinks "a foreign war is a long-felt want," or that of the *Buffalo Courier*, which says "this country recognizes British rule on this continent only because it is based on the consent of the governed." Among a great deal of insufferable insolence put forth by a number of American papers, is one statement from the *Indianapolis News* which has the merit of unquestionable truth—all but the last word, Canada being quite unconscious of "jealousy." "The feeling of Canada over Congressman Butterworth's annexation resolution seems to be a mixture of disgust, resentment and jealousy."