

## THE ORLEANS MANIFESTO.

The ignominious collapse of the Second Empire and the death of the Prince Imperial have, in all probability, consigned to the limbo of uneasy dreams the last chances of Napoleonism; and the death and testamentary dispositions of the Comte de Chambord have united the claims of the Legitimists with those of the House of Orleans in the person of the direct heir of Louis Philippe. The Republic may, therefore, be considered to have been brought face to face with her single remaining foe by the Manifesto of the Comte de Paris. But if her enemies have been practically reduced to a unity, the unit has greatly gained in power by the fusion. Nor does the representative of Monarchy hazard any of his prestige by indiscretion. A certain tone of moderation, and of acquiescence in advanced ideas has always more or less distinguished the Orleans Princes, and their Head is careful to avoid anything like the obstinate tenacity with which the late Comte de Chambord clung to obsolete pretensions, and which would probably, even under the most favorable circumstances, have rendered him an impossibility. The proclamation, therefore, breathes the spirit of an essentially modern Monarchy, though it comes to France with the credentials of a thousand years. It is in full accord with the democratic tone of modern society. The Comte de Paris' dignified moderation, combined with the strength of his position, imposes on the Republicans the necessity of taking the matter seriously, for an accomplished Prince, the victim of a harsh law of exile, who counts 200 followers in the Chamber of Deputies, and commands the sympathy of the large section of France which still respects religion, cannot be ignored or put down by ridicule, to which he does not lay himself open.

One important result of the Prince's bold stroke for power would seem to be an almost inevitable modification of the relations between M. Rouvier and the Right, the Manifesto being inconsistent with the compact under which the Government now counts on its support. It is not quite clear why the Comte has chosen the present moment for the demonstration of his position and views, as it is difficult to see that his cause is likely to gain much by the fierce outburst of political animosity which is almost sure to be provoked. The Republicans will feel themselves at bay, and the result may well be to bring to the front again extreme men and extreme measures, and to range professed Republicans under the banner of M. Clémenceau and General Boulanger, in which case it may be well for Europe if the feverish agitation of France is confined to her domestic affairs.

We are inclined, however, to think that Republicanism has taken too strong a hold on France to be easily upset. There has been almost time since the events of 1870 to mature a generation brought up under Republican influences, and the composure and self-abnegation with which the Government permits the free publication of the Manifesto, may be a sign of the consciousness of a deep-seated strength, and of the confidence born of it.

## AMERICAN HOSTILITY.

If there were any who, when the purchase of Alaska was in course of negotiation, failed to recognize in the American proffer a consistent extension of the Monroe doctrine in a direction presenting the ultimate advantage of outflanking British possessions, they must have been very blind. It is characteristic of American diplomacy to bear precedents well in mind, and to neglect no opportunity which may in the future furnish grounds for those international questions, by which the Government of the United States so well knows how to profit. Thus, on the one hand, the purchase of Louisiana from the French was not forgotten, and, on the other, we shall by and by see a fresh display of chicanery when the boundary between Canada and Alaska comes up for settlement. Meanwhile what we have to confront is the unmistakable hostility, of which the cynical insolence of Mr. Bayard furnishes us with ample evidence.

If the American Government had a shadow of just ground for the preposterous claim to constitute the Behring Sea a "mare clausum," implied in the collusive inter-action of the U. S. Government and the authorities of Alaska, the intent might be open to a doubt; but Mr. Bayard, to do him justice, scarcely condescends to veil his audacity with a duplicity so palpable that it might almost claim the merit of frank and open defiance of every law, except that which aims at the substitution of might for right, by unscrupulous and unblushing effrontery.

We cannot afford space, neither is it necessary, to go into details. We will merely record the fact that, in addition to other seizures during the present year, intelligence was brought to San Francisco on Friday, the 30th Sept., of the capture, on the 24th August, of the Canadian sealing schooner *Ada*, and still later of that of the *Mollie Darling*, whose captain is said to have been shot dead in the melée. Capture has succeeded capture, in the face of Mr. Bayard's pretended orders, issued, or said to have been issued, last February, for the discontinuance of all pending proceedings against Canadian sealers, until the number is now swelled to about a dozen. "Such outrages," as one of our city contemporaries remarks, "were never before heard of on this continent." It has become impossible to mistake the meaning of their condonation. By every means of embarrassment at their command, it is the aim of the United States to counteract, if possible, the consolidation of the Dominion, brought about by the rapid settlement of the North-West through the Canadian Pacific Railway, the value of which, as we have frequently, and long ago, pointed out, was to be measured by American jealousy and vituperation.

Several American papers have, to their honor, spoken out in strong terms of reprobation of the disgraceful proceedings of their Government, but it has become impossible to hope for the influence of any sentiment of

national honor in that direction, and we have to consider, *de facto*, a position imminently threatening to our own dignity and that of Great Britain.

At the present moment the most pressing consideration is the protection of British vessels from what is virtually little better than piracy, though practically sanctioned by a strong and unscrupulous nation.

Canada is dependent for Maritime protection on the naval forces of the Mother Country. It would seem to be the immediate duty of the Imperial Government to afford that protection by promptly strengthening the Pacific Squadron, and it should, we think, be accorded with all the better grace in view of the Imperial facilities furnished by the C. P. R., which greatly enhance the Imperial value and importance of our Pacific ports.

The situation is, however, further suggestive. We have more than once expressed our opinion that the only practical step at present discernible in the direction of Imperial Federation would be the creation of a Canadian Naval Force of real efficiency, so far as it might at the outset. It need not be of an imposing strength to begin with, but every vessel should be a powerful type of her class. We would put it at five gunboats, three for the Atlantic and two for the Pacific Coast. But they should be no ordinary gunboats—cockle shells of two or three hundred tons, with little speed and less fighting power. They should be of 800 or 1000 tons, old measurement; be able to steam at least twelve or thirteen knots; and carry two, or at least one heavy gun of long range, and two or four of less calibre, yet still of considerable power, besides Nordenfeldts or some other machine guns. Partial armor might be a question, but there should be none about water-tight compartments. Boats of such a class would not require a large staff of officers, and the large retired lists of the navy would furnish all that might be required to start with, when man-of-war experience would be necessary.

## PURITY IN STATESMANSHIP.

How many honest statesmen (or politicians) are there in the world—at least such as the world knows of, and has a ready opinion about? So far as England, Canada, and America are concerned, they might probably be counted on the fingers of one hand certainly on the fingers of two. The old country has perhaps the majority of such as we know of. One she has recently lost, Lord Iddesleigh, but she can still pride herself on possessing two, John Bright and Lord Hartington. Canada boasts of one, Alexander MacKenzie, and the example of his rectitude is not, unfortunately, likely to exercise much more of its salutary influence in the legislative halls of Ottawa. There may be a pure man or two in public life in the United States, but the peculiarities of the Republican Constitution obscure their recognition abroad, unless in one or two prominent positions, or in circumstances of exceptional publicity. Considering his consistent fight to the best of his power in the interests of political decency, we may accept Mr. Cleveland as an honest statesman, and, like England, America has lost one conspicuous on the roll of integrity in Mr. Garfield. So, after all, we come pretty well within the limits of five fingers.

Mr. Bright, disapproving of war in general, and of the Egyptian war in particular, resigned his post as a Cabinet Minister when that war was determined upon. We believe Mr. MacKenzie and Lord Hartington to be almost the only living politicians of mark capable of unostentatiously taking a like course of action. We cannot, in fact, resist the impression of a parallelism between Mr. Bright and Mr. MacKenzie, which is further suggestive of one between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Blake. Both these gentlemen are eloquent in no common degree, and we are not overrating Mr. Blake in putting him, though second, in the same category with the G. O. M. We have not at hand, at the moment we write, Macaulay's ringing description of Mr. Gladstone's writing and declamation in his essay on "Gladstone on Church and State," written some fifty years ago. If we could quote it, it would be interesting to note that it takes the measure of the veteran statesman of to-day as precisely and as graphically as it did that of the young member of parliament of 1838. To-day, as half a century ago, Mr. Gladstone is preeminent in the command of a "lofty diction," distinguished by a vast command of language of a vague and misty grandeur, which, as the great historian says, has the same effect on his hearers as that of the chorus in "The Clouds" of Aristophanes, read on an audience of Athenians. Unfortunately this grand facility lends itself but too easily to the exigencies of a position which tempts to the envelopment of intangible ideas, or the total lack of definite ideas, or the desire to conceal or obscure the ideas actually entertained, in a brilliant nebula of sounding but unmeaning rhetoric. It cannot but strike the observer that, since Mr. Blake began to discern the difficulty of formulating a policy acceptable to the country, his oratory has acquired similar characteristics. Nor does the similarity cease here. It cannot be said that either statesman has passed the ordeal of the temptations of party politics with altogether untarnished integrity.

But from this point of similarity we think we are justified in assuming a divergence in favor of the Canadian politician. That Mr. Gladstone's lust for power, and craving for popularity leads him to all lengths, is patent. Neither statesman is altogether free from a tone of cosmopolitanism, which extends almost to a lack of patriotism, but we think Mr. Blake would shrink, and we believe has shrunk, from carrying out policies tending to the dismemberment of the integrity of his country. We believe him, in this respect, to stand superior to the great man with whom we have compared him, while there is no doubt that a direct assertion from Mr. Blake would command more confidence than has lately been accorded to Mr. Gladstone.

But neither stands on the pinnacle of political integrity occupied by Mr. Bright, on some of whose recent utterances we may shortly have something to say.