

True, again, Mr. Blake talks of Imperial Federation ; but at the request of Mr. Norris, he is to relinquish this, as well as his hostility to the National Policy and the Syndicate contract ; for does not Mr. Norris say, that 'the people will not tolerate disturbing either!' Mr. Blake has sounded a note ; it is something about ' subjects of subjects,' and thereupon his utterance as a party leader, in and out of Parliament, about the National Policy and the Syndicate, have been untrue. He meant all the time just the opposite to what he said. And so he is to take the banner from the falling Conservative Chieftain, and lead on the supporters of the National Policy and the Syndicate contract to Independence, and then to Annexation. How charmingly consistent all this is !

Perhaps the most amusing thing in the 'Review,' is the outburst about the dishonour and degradation of being Colonists. A new fact has been discovered, 'the history of a colony cannot be anything but contemptible.' It is declared that 'the present generation of Canadians will be despised in a generation or two hence.' Well, perhaps some of them will be ; but that hardly justifies one in distorting history. We need not go farther than the United States to find the people who are proud to trace, back their lineage to anti-Revolutionary times, and who delight to recall the events of their colonial life. All Americans look back with pleasure upon their colonial history, as the grown man looks back upon his life prior to maturity. It is sad that Canadian colonists are 'a grade just above the coolie ;' and 'so much the worse, we do not feel our chains,' because we are ignorant and degraded like the slaves of the South before Emancipation. Now, all this would be inexpressibly sad if it were not extremely silly. In view of the fact that we legislate as we please, irrespective of the wishes of England ; that the National Policy is inimical to British trade ; and that the London *Times*, the ad-

herents of the Manchester School, and many public men in England have repeatedly told us, that we are at liberty to sever the colonial tie when we please, this sort of writing will, by many, be regarded as unintelligible.

We do not propose in this article to discuss the Future of Canada, not that we think it inexpedient ; but from want of space and leisure. Much, however, can be said in support of the view held by Sir Francis Hincks, that it is undesirable to do so. The growth and development of the Dominion is most probably as rapid as is consistent with the stability of our institutions. Precocity in natural life is as likely to be followed by early death, or a want of manly vigour at maturity, as in the individual man. The person who is ashamed of being a Colonist is like the irrepressible youth, who runs away from home before he is able to take care of himself. By all means, however, let every one who thinks he has a mission preach immediate Independence or Annexation ; but it is to be hoped that the few who wish for national extinction will not take Mr. Norris's advice, and say they only mean Independence. While we would give Annexationists every opportunity to parade their arguments in its favour, we take the liberty of presenting the views of one who having prophesied that it must come to pass loses no opportunity of showing that his prophecy must or ought to come true. Professor Goldwin Smith has done what he could to indoctrinate Canadians with a belief in such manifest destiny, and we cannot be accused of giving the opinion of one hostile thereto, if we quote from his writings. Sir Francis Hincks, in the *Fortnightly Review*, produces statements made by Prof. Smith in the *Bystander* for 1880, concerning the United States, which are submitted for the consideration of the readers of the CANADIAN MONTHLY, especially those in favour of Annexation, either directly or by way of premature Independence. It will be seen that the