

Secretary of State for the Colonies, expressed an opinion in his evidence before a select committee of the House of Commons that it could not be supposed that the sentiment of loyalty was very strong in Canada. If our material interests are not benefited by the connection we confess that we have not much faith in the sentiment of loyalty, and we, therefore, subscribe to the following remarks in "Current Events": "Sentiment may do much, but the loyalty of Canadians rests in a deep-seated conviction that their material progress and all that makes for their advancement as a nation are bound up in British connection." We cannot concur in the opinion that "these would receive an incalculable impetus from a closer relationship with England." On the contrary, our conviction is that, if the day should unhappily arrive when Canada shall be required, as a condition of maintaining her connection with the Empire, to assume a share of the imperial burthens which are enormously large, owing to her being one of the great European powers, the separation from Great Britain and annexation to the United States will be inevitable. The writer of "Current Events," in his desire to establish the futility of one of Lord Blachford's objections, which was that the colonies might have eventually the greater share in the government of the British Confederacy, argues that, under any system that would be adopted, England "would continue to possess, of right and of necessity, a largely preponderating influence in the council of the Federated Empire." That, most assuredly, would be the case during many generations, but Lord Blachford was looking to a distant future, and was, moreover, speculating on what would have been the result had the old American colonies remained in connection with the Empire, and had such a federative system been established. We are not inclined to make forecasts of the future, and it is even more unprofitable to speculate on what might have been the consequences had the systems of government applied in modern times to the self-governing colonies been granted to the old American colonies. So far as it is possible to form a judgment from probabilities, the separation of the old colonies was the consequence of the conquest of Canada and the expulsion of the French from North America. So long as the old colonists had a warlike and aggressive nation in their immediate vicinity, they would, from motives of self-interest, have preserved their connection with a powerful European State; and even after the conquest, had the same powers of self-government been conceded that we enjoy, and

the same abnegation of taxation for imperial purposes been observed, the sentiment of loyalty which really existed in the old colonies just as strongly when George III. ascended the throne, as it does in Canada under Queen Victoria, would have led, at all events, to a very long continuance of the connection. The attempt to tax for imperial purposes extinguished the sentiment of loyalty in the old colonies, and our firm conviction is that Imperial confederation, under any plan that can be devised, would lead to a similar result. We noticed with regret that the Premier in his late speech in Montreal gave some countenance to this federation scheme. We have dwelt on this subject because the question is one that bears, in no small degree, on the taxation of the people, and because it is much the most interesting portion of the leading article in the *Canadian Monthly*. Messrs. Cauchon, Laurier, the propaganda at Rome, and the political picnics, the public have probably had enough of, but we have something to say on the reference to the fiscal policy of the Dominion by the writer of "Current Events." We confess that we are wholly unable to comprehend the views of those who hold that "happily this is not a party question." We should be very glad indeed to be informed what "party question" is of more importance, if the views of those who make such declarations are correct. The words that we have quoted are preceded by the following: "What Mr. Cartwright's policy is we know without having the slightest suspicion of his next budget; what nationalists believe to be the true Canadian policy, whether they call themselves reformers, conservatives or independents we also know, and the issue is between them." If the author of these remarks fully comprehended the system of government under which he is living, he would know that the "Nationalists" have not the most remote chance of changing the fiscal policy of the Dominion except through the instrumentality of party. It is hardly possible to estimate the strength of public opinion in favor either of protection or free trade so long as those questions are treated as not belonging to party. But strange to say, the cry of the Nationalists, as they call themselves, has been that there is no party question in Canada, and that consequent thereon both of her political parties have been merely gaspers for office. If we are not mistaken, moreover, the Nationalists or Canada First party, which is strong in favor of protection, used all the influence it could command to place a Free Trade government in power. We are told in one sentence that

"Provincial decrepitude and decay can be the only issue" of the absence of manufactures, and that the people at the polls should insist on the reversal of the present policy, while elsewhere we are assured that "happily this is not a party question," and therefore we are to go "to decrepitude and decay" while we are fighting over the really party questions which nevertheless the writer of "Current Events" has not indicated. What can these party questions be? Mr. Blake, in his Teeswater speech, took credit for certain measures which had been carried by the government, but he did not indicate any important measures to be brought forward. Mr. Laurier when before his constituents held out prospects of reciprocity which is really not a party question because there is no difference of opinion on the subject in Canada, and because it depends on the action of a foreign power. To us it seems inevitable that the next Canadian political contest must turn on the fiscal policy to be adopted, and if the consequence should be a disruption of the present political parties, it would probably be a fortunate circumstance, inasmuch as it would tend to eliminate from our politics the violent personal bitterness which has been the most marked feature of the recent political picnics. "Our Future" is the text of a short article in the *Canadian Monthly*, the object of which is to advocate independence, one of the visionary schemes of those who are bent on change, but who have nearly all abandoned it in favor either of annexation or Imperial confederation. The writer of "Our Future," whose *nom de plume* is "Argus," is a Nova Scotian, who, after ten years absence, travels through Canada partly "to endeavor to gain a thorough knowledge of the social and political condition of the people," and who in the course of his peregrinations finds himself in the Mountain Park of our own city of Montreal, on a beautiful day in August, idly smoking a cigar in the cool shade of the trees. While there, he falls in with a young man of about 25 years of age with whom he contracts a casual acquaintance, and whom he asks to give him "his idea of the present state of things, and what he thought of the political future." It may be questionable how far it was worth while to communicate to the public the opinions of a young dreamer; but, after all, the object of the *Review* is to furnish amusement to its readers as well as solid information, and we confess that we were not a little amused with the speculations of this great unknown, and more especially with one passage. His great object