DIOCLETIAN AT SPALATRO.

DIOCLES, Docles, Diocletian-From the slaves' quarters to the Golden Gate Of this fair palace, where at even-time I sit and dream of empire, tracing back Life's changes in the changes of a name. Would that Maximian were alive to laugh Perchance, indeed, he does make merry now That I regret the purple. Him, poor friend, A double abdication did not save From dyeing his bed to the imperial hue-A late imperial fashion; by the gods I care not for it; better die in peace. Yet would I live life over once again, And take its chances; be the freedman's son, Plain Docles, who, for sake of euphony, One morning turned to Diocles, to climb

Of Diocletianus.

What will they
Who follow after say of me? That I,
Setting aside our glorious Eponym
The first Augustus—ranked in length of reign
Fourth of the Emperors?—of the other three,
Tiberius I like not; Hadrian
And Antoninus make good company.
They had wit to keep their heads on, so had I.
But, more than they, I fell on evil times;
Their house was left in order, I rebuilt
The shattered walls of empire, Trajan cleansed
For them the Imperial Purple, which to me
Came daubed with blood, foul with debauchery.

The slippery heights of power until he found

A foothold, firm to bear the added weight

Wise was it for Augustus and for them To walk as men among their fellowmen, In artful self-denial! but for us There needed other methods—diadems To raise us up a little, jewelled shoes To mark our feet as sacred. I have found That silken robes, when hung about a king, Are better surety than a coat of mail Against Praetorian daggers.

When I bowed
Beneath the weight of empire, fearlessly
I quartered up the burden; if they failed,
These since-succeeding Cæsars, they but lacked
The knowledge of the traces—would the gods
That I could grasp the reins!
Nay, better thus, oh Æsculapius,
Who dwell in yonder temple! For, long since,
I should have died in harness. Better here
To dream the past is with me, by the sea.
Long years of toil to win short years of rest,
And, after death, a name among the gods.

J. Ross-Wetherman.

COLONIAL CULTURE.

IT may be asked whether the colonies have as yet produced that literary or artistic development which we expect from populations so happy and so intelligent as those which I have described. I have already spoken of the necessary absence as yet in the colonies of a leisured class. In the eastern portion of the United States, which although exposed, as are the colonies, to the literary competition of the United Kingdom, possesses a proportionately larger leisured class than do the newer Canada or Australia or the Western States there is a more widespread literary cultivation than in any of the old countries of the world. Great results have already been achieved by people of the United States in the realms of science, although these cannot be attributed to the leisured class, and American Science is more practical than ours, and runs more into invention, because the rewards of invention are in America greater and more rapid. Even pure science has its students, however, in the Eastern States, as poetry is not wanting in Canada and Australia, in spite of the powerful influence and competition of contemporary English Literature. I have already named colony by colony the most conspicuous examples of a success in literature which is rather ignored at home than lacking in the colonies.

Colonial architecture, although not good, compares favourably with that of the dwellings of the British middle class. At the same time our colonists are in this respect behind the colonists of foreign races established in their midst. The French domestic architecture of Lower Canada, and the Dutch domestic architecture of South Africa are picturesque, and free from that element of meanness or vulgarity which too often characterises British architecture in all parts of the world. The fine Dutch homesteads of the Cape, with their indispensable verandahs, are perfect specimens of simple architecture—are perfect as are the houses of the pest Flemish towns, with the additional advantage of being placed smid beautiful surroundings and shaded by magnificent old trees. The French architecture of Quebec is superior, too, to that of Canada in general; but in Australia the opulence and comfort of the colonial Britons have helped them to create a school of architecture which is beautifying the cities day by day.

It must be admitted, however, that colonial democracy and the race for wealth, combined with the free importation of the literature of the Mother Country and of the art of France, have caused the best writings of the colonies to be found in the pages of their newspapers, and,

as regards art, have prolonged the duration of its infancy. I have already spoken of the wonderful development of the Australian and the Canadian press, but in this respect, at all events, South Africa is not behind. The leaders in the two daily papers of Capetown are distinctly above the average of the newspaper literature of Europe; and in South Africa, as in Australia, the weekly editions of the leading papers are marvels of literary production, and widely read. The number of colonial papers is as remarkable as their ability and their circulation, and the Transvaal is a British Colony in this respect. In the single young town of Johannesburg, within twelve months of its foundation under Dutch rule, there were six English newspapers; and even in Pretoria, where the British colonial element is smaller, there are several excellent English journals.

It would, I am convinced, be a mistake to suppose that the partial absence of a literature, other than newspaper literature, in our colonies is in any degree the result of democratic institutions. M. de Tocqueville pointed out that in the United States in his day there was little art or literature, and that many Europeans who had been struck by this fact had thought it a result of democracy, whereas they had confused what was democratic with what only was American. Time has shown Tocqueville to be right, and America has been making steady progress in science and literature at least, though she has not progressed as yet with equal rapidity, if we exclude the American studios of Paris, in the field of art. Writers who record for us, with regard to our own colonies, opinions similar to those which fell under Tocqueville's censure are likely to prove wrong. Other observations, indeed, of Tocqueville's upon the same subject, also apply as well to the colonies of today as to the America of his time. For example, he shows how the Americans finding among the English, whose tongue they spoke, distinguished men of science and writers of eminence, were enabled to enjoy the treasures of the intellect without having to labour to amass them; and how the American people of his day were intellectually a portion of the English, and were merely, in fact, the English who happened to be out west. Tocqueville, with great eloquence, pointed out how democracy is likely in the long run to favour science and literature by enormously increasing the numbers of those who have the taste for intellectual enjoyment as compared with those who have the ability to indulge it in aristocratic societies. At the same time he showed how in democratic communities with their active life there would be less tendency towards meditation; and how, therefore, the literary work of democratic communities would probably possess a more practical turn than that of aristocracies. It has often been remarked with what foresight—a foresight due at least as much to his habit of patient study as to natural ability-Tocqueville prophesied the future of the communities which he had seen at their daily toil, and it is remarkable to trace the degree to which his observations on the America of his time fit the Australia and the Canada of our own.

In a literary sense the colonies may, indeed, be said to stand now in pretty much the same position in which the United States stood in the time of Tocqueville, and America made a little later a great literary advance. Though it may still be said of the American people that their reading is not over choice, and that they are largely fed upon telegrams and sensational stories, nevertheless the country has produced a powerful literary class and some literary work of the highest merit. In the colonies there is almost as much literary dependency upon England now as there was formerly in the United States; but there is every reason to hope that the universal diffusion of reading power among the people, and the influence of free libraries, public discussion societies, and other means of rousing intellectual interest, will lead to the same good results throughout all Greater Britain which have been witnessed in the United States. While in the richer among the old countries of Europe there is a larger literary class in proportion than can exist in a new country, I am disposed to doubt whether the population generally are more literary in their studies than in new countries. It is often said that the people of the colonies are superficial in their tastes, that they like a smattering of literature of a easy type, and a smattering of science, but do not read deeply; but I doubt myself whether a careful examination of the statistics of English free libraries would show the existence of a better state of things among ourselves. There are, naturally and necessarily, more people with leisure, and more people of the highest cultivation, in proportion to the numbers of the population here than can be the case in the younger countries, and that is all. Olive Schreiner among novelists and for the Cape, Henry Kendall among poets and for Australia, not to speak of statisticians, and of the political essayists of Canada, form the first of a future race of Colonial writers; while Marcus Clarke and Brunton Stephens, of the British-born colonists, may be counted as colonial as the colonists themselves, and equally precursors of the colonial literature of the future. Although Adam Lindsay Gordon killed himself, and Marcus Clarke died in poverty, and Kendall had little better fate, it may, I think, be safely predicted that the day will come when colonial literature will hold its own with the literature of the mother-country, and Letters form an acknowledged and sufficient colonial career. The colonists are no more likely to be content with inferior work in literature and art than they are in other matters. In their newspaper press they expect and obtain, as I have shown, the best. Their Universities are remarkable; the organization of secondary instruction admirable; their

as regards the loyalty of the people to the Empire, from that which has occurred in Canada. When Local Federation is attained the only organization in those colonies which can be really said to be infected with disloyalty—and that through narrow-minded ignorance alone—the Australian Natives' Association, will practically cease to exist, and a higher and nobler sentiment will be inculcated in the minds of the natives of the country, than that which would regard all not born within its shores as aliens and strangers. Such a party, the "no-nothing party" as it was called, once filled a feeble and flickering place in a long-forgotten page of American history, and is not likely to take a more prominent place in that of Australia.

And now in bringing this necessarily slight sketch to a close, I would draw attention to the fact that certain primary national principles are common to both Canada and Australia. The first is self-confidence. By its means Canada struggled amid many and diverse difficulties and dangers, until she has attained her present high position. By it she built her great national highway from sea to sea and successfully united her distant and sometimes discordant

dominions.

By it Australia has struggled with the difficulties of settlement and the effects of provincial jealousies, which have, however, really worked more good than ill by increasing the efforts of the individual colonies through the stern teacher—competition. By it she has passed from a penal colony to a proud position in the freest empire in the world.

Again, development of natural resources. In this respect both countries possess a common national necessity. Each has enormous potential power of wealth and prosperity in land, and mineral resources, the products of the sea and of the forest. Each requires an increase of population and a diffusion of capital, and to a common centre the policy of both must be directed.

For this reason, if for no other, because Great Britain has the men and money which these great wings of the Empire require, the unity of that constitutional structure must be maintained and consolidated, as opportunity

offers.

The third common interest of the two countries is the extension of our commerce. With the question of its safety I have already dealt, and little more than a passing reference need be made to the obvious fact that for both alike,

Great Britain is the principal market.

It is well to remember in this connection that, according to Mulhall, the trade of the mother country increased from 1870 to 1885 with the Colonies \$187,000,000, while it decreased with foreign countries to the figure of \$230,000,000; that Australia does nearly the whole of its outside trade with Great Britain, and that while Canada now does 42 per cent. of its total trade with the mother country, the time may be coming, as a result of American policy, when it will be a matter of life and death to our farmers to create a still wider interchange of trade with Britain and in the interest of all classes of our community to promote closer trade relations with the constantly expanding market which the growing population and prosperity of Australia will offer to them.

Thus as a natural development of all that has gone before in our history and progress we have a more than common interest in bringing about what Sir Charles Gavan Duffy has recently styled the "wise and salutary design of federating the British Empire." I cannot here do more than mention a policy which would develop colonial resources and increase our national wealth; encourage immigration, diffuse capital, increase confidence and bring about the time when, as the Toronto Globe, with a prophetic insight which it has since, I regret to say, lost, in discussing Mr. Blake's famous Aurora speech in 1875, said, "the only country colonists will recognize as theirs will be the British Empire, and the only national sentiment they will deem worthy of cherishing will be one that thinks not of 'Canada first' or 'Australia first,' but of the grand old British Empire first and of all who love their sovereign, and all who swear by the 'Old Flag at first, at last, and in the midst as well."

In conclusion, let me say that my reason for selecting this subject was mainly that in order to obtain a reciprocity of advantages from our present union with Australia a reciprocity of knowledge is desirable, and if I have been able to throw the slightest side-light upon the relations which have existed between us in the past and which should be created in the future, I am more than satisfied.

Of that future we need not have the remotest fear as long as the people of Great Britain look upon the colonies, in the recent words of the Prince of Wales, "as integral parts of the Empire," and the inhabitants "as brethren, no less dear to us than if they dwelt in Surrey or in

Kent."

Let Canadians ever bear in mind those noble and stirring words of D'Arcy McGee when he said, just prior to Confederation, "I emphatically deny the preëminence of any other power upon this continent; we are the leading power on this continent, for we are a part of the greatest empire on earth, the Empire of Britain, whose blood permeates the world, whose flag is the emblem of power, grandeur and civilization, and as such we brook no peer," and look forward to the time when

Canada, Africa, Zealand, Australia, India, Continents, Isles of the sea, Adding your jewels to Britain's regalia, One with Old England, the home of the free.

"What is the first step towards securing a divorce?" asked a client of a Philadelphia lawyer. "Get married," was the prompt reply.