

EXCHANGES.

We notice among the exchanges of the *Varsity*, of the University of Toronto, a lengthy article signed "Canuck," which purports to be an answer to an article published in the FREE LANCE in February entitled "Why Should We Annex Canada;" which article he assumes is offensive to Canadians.

He states that he was amused at the article and jests at the ignorance which he says is displayed in it; yet as he proceeds he takes great care to exaggerate on a large portion of the thought contained and to misconstrue the one and only object which the article presents. Nothing is more apparent to us than that Canuck has long been waiting for a plausible excuse to strut himself; for he makes bold to mention that, "If the Yankee will keep his nose out of Canadian affairs for a few years, we will give him a pretty hot race for the commercial supremacy of this continent."

The only object for which our article was intended and the only thing which it tries to show, is, that Canada should not be annexed to the U. S. even if annexation were possible; it criticises Americans for entertaining a thought of annexation; it assumes that all such talk of annexation as we mention, is but the gossip of unauthorized men in an unofficial way; in no instance does it extend to Canada the hostility, the feeling of her general inferiority, or the disrespect which he claims that it does. Yet by his assumed inference he has attempted to demonstrate what we have not submitted. He assumes that our article portrays the population of Canada as composed of "squatters," "shanty men," "poor fishermen" etc., and that if we chose, we could annex Canada at any time at our own will. No imputation could be more misleading, as anyone can see who reads both articles.

He challenges us to compare his government with ours and tell which means government by the people, which the freer from despotism and tyranny: We do not need to answer his chal-

lenge, for we only implied a difference between the institutions of the two countries, and this difference he admits in the wording of his challenge. (He does not say anything about their other institution?)

Now Canuck, we admire you for the strides which you say you have made during the last twenty-five years; we have respect for your people; and while we would have better relations with you, we never wished you in the family, because we think it more congenial to have you at a distance as you now are. We do not want to strike you down now because we "fear the future." Oh, no! Keep right on in your prosperity; we do not desire to disturb you. Do not fear!

However we will look over with you one of your proffered points on which you seem so eager for debate.

You say: "We have to remind you how badly the (American) Eagle has had his feathers ruffled every time he has attempted to prey upon our heritage"; and, "Let him (Uncle Sam) make the slightest advance toward a trespass and he will soon realize how faithfully the British Lion guards the entrance."

Ha! Ha! What bluster from a foster-child of John Bull! Where have you been Canuck, every time the "Eagle has had his feathers so badly ruffled?" You have been just where the Lion has had his tail—between his hind feet. Where are you now? Under his paw, eh! Then if he gives you a chance to respire freely at times, how truly you ought to say that he faithfully guards the entrance (of your wind)! Perhaps you forget how equally well he guarded its *exit* in 1837.

The recent issue of the North Carolina *University Magazine* published an excellent article entitled "The Negro must remain South." The writer forcibly describes the havoc that would be caused in the South by the forced emigration of the negro. He says:

"Who can fortell the disasters and the ruin that would follow in the retreating steps of the Southern laborers? Farm operations would be stopped