

endangered from any cause (a contingency not apparent in our case), to raise the necessary means by public assessment within the limits of the people's ability to bear such taxation or assessment.

4. That the field of circulation of the new notes will be (over and above any wants that may exist in the older Provinces of the Dominion) in the rapidly developing and civilizing area of Manitoba and the North-West; the general rule being that a country whose population is increasing will demand additions of currency at proper intervals, while one on the decreasing scale will require its note currency to be curtailed in proportion to such periodical decrease.

5. That contraction of circulation will at any time be possible if more or gradually made, but that it is hard to see how this could become necessary if the original issues shall have been adjusted to the local needs and capacities, because the working and trading population of the new districts is not likely to become seriously diminished at any time that we can conceive of—not even when the line of the Pacific Railway shall have been completed.

Yours, &c.,

Critic.

I have received a letter from M. Bilbon, le Secrétaire de la Société des Symphonistes de Montreal, but it is too late for insertion this week.

Those of us who are outside of Parliament and violent party politics find it hard to understand why there should be so much bitter personality in the House of Commons debates. Criticism there should be at all times; strong and determined opposition sometimes; but why should gentlemen yield to the depravity that is in them and abuse each other as if the world could find no worse personal enemies? What a fight the newly made knights indulged in over the Budget Speech? Sir Leonard Tilley was calm, clear and fairly reasonable in criticism and prophecy. Sir Richard Cartwright tried to keep in the straight path of fair discussion, but deflected now and then to the right and to the left. Sir Charles Tupper followed, and by whole leagues out-Heroded Herod; it was a very storm of abuse; it was a hurricane; words roared and rattled about the House; great hail from a cloud beat upon that poor "fly on the wheel," and accomplished—nothing, nothing at all. It was not even amusing. These knightly combats are out of date. Mr. Ross managed to mar an otherwise very good speech by indulging in the same objectionable style of oratory. He, too, ranted against those opposed to him, as if vulgarity could sustain an argument. This is not what we are demanding of our M.P.'s. We want a critical discussion of Sir Leonard's Budget; we want to know how far his figures may be relied upon, and whether his calculations are reasonable. But this invective gives no information, and abuse is not argument. When will our politicians learn this?

There are well authenticated rumours of troubles in the Quebec Cabinet. They have been inevitable from the first, and the only wonder is that they have been staved off so long. M. Chapleau foresaw the difficulties, and was anxious to wait for the final assault upon M. Joly until expenditure should drive the Premier to ask for direct taxation. When the unbridled zeal-for-office of his party, and the heedless councillors had forced M. Joly from power, M. Chapleau tried to form a coalition government. In that he failed, for the Liberals were, with a few exceptions, true to their cause and leaders. But now the pressure begins to tell upon the newly-formed Ministry. Money must be found, and the question is, where to find it? If M. Chapleau should call the Provincial Parliament together and propound a scheme for direct taxation he will certainly be beaten; if he appeal from the Legislature to the electors he will be beaten again. At present two courses are open to him; the first is, to appeal to the Province on the general question of confidence—which would probably send him back to office with an increased majority; the second is, to get from the Liberal side of the House some of its strongest members to join his Cabinet. The former he can do, if he will; the latter is problematical. If I were a *Bleu* I should say, ask for a dissolution.

Mr. Granville C. Cunningham discusses "Federation, Annexation or Independence" in the current number of the *Canadian Monthly*, starting with the postulate that the question "will ere long be brought within the domain of practical politics." That may be true, for Mr.

Cunningham has had an easy task in proving "that the position in which this country at present stands to the rest of the world is not a permanent position; that the growth and expansion of the country, in wealth, population, and territorial control, must be accompanied by a corresponding growth and expansion of the political system." So much is allowed on all sides; some having gone so far as to say that when we have a population of ten millions we must have some change in our commercial and political relations with the outside world. And, as it is possible, though not at all probable, that we shall reach that figure during the next fifty years, it seems necessary that we should discuss all kinds of changes in order that we may, when the time comes, adopt that which is best. "Shall we have an Imperial Federation of the British Empire," says the writer named, "with all parts of the Empire represented in one Imperial Parliament? or shall we have annexation to the United States, with representatives at the Congress at Washington? or shall we have Canadian Independence, with our own Chief Executive officer, and our own Supreme Parliament. Which?"

Mr. Cunningham proceeds to say that one or other we must decide for, and backs up his statement by showing that if England were to go to war to-morrow with any of the Great Powers of Europe it would disastrously affect Canada, and that in matters of commerce Canada has no power to make treaties with foreign nations; and also, that we have no "right to confer naturalization upon foreigners, and to afford protection to them when abroad." From all this Mr. Cunningham argues that a change is inevitable. He considers first of all the idea of Federation, and convincing himself that this is the best of all possible schemes, has no difficulty in proving that anything else is not to be thought of. Granted. "Annexation or Independence" is not to be thought of. Only double-dyed traitors ever think of either the one or the other. These are not open questions; they are beneath consideration, to say nothing of controversy. Canada cannot be annexed to the United States, nor can Canada become an independent nation. But an Imperial Federation is possible. Did Mr. Cunningham, of Toronto, ever try the experiment of sitting down and crying for the moon? What a splendid idea? "The Imperial House might at first be 300, distributed somewhat as follows:—

England.....	180
Scotland	25
Ireland	45
Colonies.....	50."

Out of this Canada is to have 20 members. So, in this brilliant scheme, English votes are to outnumber all the rest, and India, Wales, the Cape, and half a dozen other places belonging to the Empire are not counted. The scheme is just as much to the English mind as Home Rule for Ireland, and the realization of it just as near as the Greek Kalends. Mr. Cunningham decidedly strangles his own idea and speaks the truth when he says:—

"Though the benefit resulting to England and her colonies from a Federal Union are immense, and scarcely to be over-estimated; yet we cannot be blind to the fact that there would be great difficulties in the way of securing this. Not the least among these would be the stubborn resistance of the English people to change, in the political system, simply because it was change. Though a federation of the Empire is now favourably viewed by many of the leading men in England in various classes in life; though it could be shown to be most productive of beneficial results to both England and her colonies under various aspects; yet it must be a considerable time before the arguments in its favour have sufficiently permeated society to become a moving force in any political action. In the present state of public opinion, no political leader could adopt 'Federation of the Empire' as the watch-word of his party. Perhaps, too, before this proper understanding had been reached, the forces at work in Canada would have advised separation from England as the readier and better way of bringing about the desired political change."

The peculiarity of all this is that Mr. Cunningham tells us we cannot have what would best serve our interests, and shall be compelled to accept what will prove our entire absorption by the United States, or, being relegated to the ridiculous position of an independent country. Imperial Federation is only a dream, and whenever any