

about to land, they opened on his boats with grape and canister, capturing one and driving the others across the St. Lawrence. News of this success was immediately despatched to Montgomery, who communicated it to Major Preston, the valiant commander of the besieged garrison, along with a summons to surrender. Preston demanded four days of armistice, to decide upon his course. This was refused by Montgomery, who declared that he was willing to grant honorable terms to an enemy who had displayed so much fortitude and bravery, but that he was in a position to prosecute the siege with renewed vigor, and demanded an unconditional surrender. The fact was that the Americans, besides being emboldened by their successes at Chambly and Longueuil, had erected a powerful battery within 700 feet of Fort St. Johns, and also a strong block house on the Iberville side of the river, bearing direct on the works and mounted with one gun and two mortars.

Major Preston, feeling his helplessness and complete isolation, at length consented to capitulate. He obtained honorable terms. The place where his troops laid down their arms was the open plain between the fort and the American breastwork, now traversed diagonally by the railway to Montreal.

The siege had lasted six weeks, and the garrison which surrendered consisted of five hundred regular British troops and one hundred Canadian volunteers. There were a few civilians, too, included among these, whether residents of St. Johns or its environs we have not been able to ascertain.

The Americans captured 39 pieces of cannon from 2 to 22-pounders, 2 howitzers, 7 mortars, 800 stand of arms and a scanty supply of ammunition.

The fall of St. Johns created much anxiety in Montreal and Quebec. It opened the way for the march of the American invading army and supplied it with an excellent base of operations. Carleton had tried hard to prevent the advance of Montgomery and had not succeeded. Nothing now prevented this officer from proceeding to Montreal. Carleton's only hope was that the approach of the cold season and the insubordination in Montgomery's camp would give him time to concentrate his forces.

The St. Johns' garrison surrendered, Nov. 1st, 1775. The Americans took immediate possession of the fort and retained it just 6 months, till May 1776, when they were driven out of it by Burgoyne.

The block house built by Montgomery on the other side of the river was still visible up to a few years ago.—*St. John's News.*

The British Colonial Empire.

The *London Times* of a recent date has the following:—The Blue book in which the Colonial office lays before parliament statistical accounts of our colonial and other possessions contains this year no less than 634 folio pages. The volume has become so large that a small "Statistical Abstract" has been found acceptable. Our Indian possessions are described as having an area of 956,436 square miles with a population of 144,948,356, the native States of India (as distinguished from British India) having an area of 596,790 square miles, and a population of 47,909,199, besides which there are in India 1,254 square miles of native States under the French or the Portuguese Government, with a population of 517,149. The area of our North American colonies is 632,361 square miles, with a population of 3,701,461; and this does not include the vast territory administered by the Hudson's Bay Company. Australia contains an area of 2,582,070 square miles, and a population of 1,599,580; the British West Indies an area of 88,683 square miles, and a population of 1,097,627; the Cape of Good Hope and Natal 119,322 square miles, and 485,676 people; Ceylon 24,700 square miles, and a population of 2,049,728. Our other colonies being added, the general total is an area of 5,427,232 square miles, and a population of 154,810,787 souls; and this notwithstanding some omissions on account of returns not received—the aborigines of British Columbia, and some 150,000 persons on

the 6,000 square miles of the Gold Coast settlement. The parent State, the United Kingdom, has an area of no more than 160,000 square miles, and a population not much exceeding 30,000,000. The public revenue of these vast possessions abroad was nearly £63,000,000 in the year 1865, the year for which these returns are made; it approaches that of the mother country. Not so the public debt; it is not quite £140,000,000. The tonnage entered and cleared in 1865, exclusive of the coasting trade, was about 26,000,000. The imports into these British possessions in 1865, including bullion and specie, amounted in value to £128,375,053; worth more than £66,000,000 were from the United Kingdom. The exports amounted to £141, £268,102; £75,419,159 of these exports went to the United Kingdom. These great possessions sent forth, for the supply of the world in that year, wool of the value of £12,234,580; raw sugar, £7,158,163; coffee, £3,308,963; wood, £3,877,530; fish, £1,668,260. India alone, in the year ending April, 1865; sent out raw cotton of the value of £37,573,637. Such is the British colonial empire. Queen Victoria is monarch of all here surveyed. The supply of cotton was of exceptional amount during the great American conflict; but most of even these great figures have already become an under statement, for population, production, and consumption alike have increased and are increasing."

EDUCATION.

What is, and may be, meant by teaching "English."

A paper read before the College of Preceptors, England, by J. D. M. Meiklejohn, Esq., M. A., Dr. W. B. Hodgson, occupying the chair.

The strong tide of new life in Education, which is bringing with it so many good things for the future of the English nation, bears towards us few better gifts than the profound interest in our mother tongue which is being everywhere excited among English men and English women. In spite of the fact, that the greatest poets and thinkers and novelists that the world can show have used the English language as their instrument, the conscious respect shown to this instrument for hundreds of years has been but slight; and it is only within the last forty or fifty years that its build, its physiology (if the term may be used), and its history have come to be studied. Not till the works of Grimm, Latham, Guest, Garnett, Müller, and others, appeared, did we know anything about its history; so far as our text-books went, we had no right to believe it had a history at all. On the contrary, the schoolboy was early taught, as an orthodox dogma on which the shadow of doubt had never fallen, that the English language was a stiff, rusty-jointed, and pedantic lingo, which sprang full-grown and fully equipped from the brain of an American gentleman of the name of Lindley Murray. But the positive marks of contempt for the English language lie in one word over many hundred years, and are not difficult to find. A poet, Waller, in the end of the seventeenth century, himself in the higher ranks of authorship, writes thus about the English language:—

Poets may boast, as safely vain,
Their works shall with the world remain;
But, bound together, live or die—
The verses and the prophecy.

But who can hope his lines should long
Last in a daily-changing tongue?
While they are new, envy prevails;
And, when that dies, our language fails.

When architects have done their part,
The matter may betray their art;
Time, if we use ill-chosen stone,
Soon brings a well-built palace down.

Poets that lasting marble seek,
Must carve in Latin or in Greek;
We write in sand; our language grows,
And, like the tide, our work o'erflows.