

successful, he will not be deterred, but put his threat (?) into execution.

We are told that 'it is not to be denied, that the Pacific Railway has been instigated by the Imperial Government.' How any one with a knowledge of Canadian events since Confederation can make such a statement passes understanding. And it would be a real curiosity to see one Englishman to whom it is a constant source of irritation to have to travel over the American Union Pacific. Surely we have a right to know who 'those people' are, who 'talk about the time when they will have an all-way route through our territory, at the expense of the Canadians.'

Mr. Norris goes in wildly for Independence, but a crowned King at Ottawa would spoil it all. Republicans will, no doubt, rejoice to hear that the air of North America is not good for Monarchs. But it does not seem to be the air after all, for it appears that when three great questions are settled in England, as all good Republicans wish, 'probably in twenty years, the Monarchy will not last long.' This is all very startling, and will cause the Royal family sleepless nights; but what has it to do with political parties in Canada?

In his review of the Reform party, referring to the late Senator Brown, Mr. Norris sagely asserts that 'it is an evil thing for a party, for its leader to be a foreigner.' Is not this Canadianism run mad? A little further on we are informed, regretfully, that the influence of the *Globe* is still immense, and that it may keep the Reform party out of power for the next twenty years; but on the other hand, in the next paragraph, we have it stated that the class represented by Mr. Mowat and Mr. Gordon Brown have passed their last days; and there is 'nothing to dread in this old remnant of Toryism,' the *Globe*.

The Reform party, it seems, according to Mr. Norris, is made up of two classes—fossilized Tories, and men of

American proclivities. The latter are to be feared; they are dangerous to the usefulness of the Liberal party, because they secretly favour Annexation, but have not the moral courage openly to advocate that measure. We are left in doubt as to why they are dangerous, whether it is because they are Annexationists, or because they have not the moral courage to advocate it openly. After claiming that they have a right to discuss the benefits they think Canada would derive from the Union with the United States, a right which no body denies, Mr. Norris invites these timid people, and all Annexationists, to act the hypocrite. He tells them that Annexation cannot be attained directly, 'they are losing their time and delaying the success of the national cause.' They must first be satisfied with Independence, as 'it surely helps toward their aim, if they only take the right way to attain it.' If this is the programme, the cause of Independence will indeed be a failure. There are many Canadians who believe that some time in the future, when Canada shall have sufficiently grown and developed its resources, it will, like the ripe fruit, drop into Independence. But the admission that Independence is to be, or may be, a stepping stone to Annexation, will prevent all thoughtful and true Canadians from supporting a scheme which might, not to say would, lead to national extinction. Probably the Liberals with American proclivities will not accept the invitation to pull in the same boat with Mr. Norris, for he states after all that 'Annexation directly is possible, as we have only to consult ourselves, the Americans and England.'

Mr. Norris has a liking for Mr. Blake, although 'hitherto he has not shown that strength of character so necessary in a leader.' It is true that he opposes the National Policy, which is a mystery to Mr. Norris; but that is nothing. He was fortunate in his having shirked a party vote in the Letellier affair, according to Mr. Norris's ethics.