

Chamberlain, hearkening to Sir Gordon Sprigg, has declined to entertain the proposal, and it is to be hoped that the Cape Premier will manifest the moderation that the situation requires.

The position of affairs is, in some respects, like that which followed the rebellion in Canada. Had an interval of rest intervened between the passage of the Union Act and the assumption of its constitutional privileges, some might argue that the Parliament House in Montreal would have escaped the brands of Mr. Fred Perry and his fellow-enthusiasts. Who can say? We hope that there will be no ultra-loyalist arson in Cape Colony. At any rate, in spite of Mr. Rhodes, of whose death-bed plea for suspension Dr. Jameson was the confidant, Mr. Chamberlain is determined to avoid Mr. Gladstone's mistake in making loyal men suffer for the sins of the disloyal. All but a handful of the spouting, agitating class will doubtless be only too glad to avail themselves of restored tranquillity to attend profitably to their own affairs and to take up anew the painfully severed thread of domestic life.

During the course of the war a good deal of discussion has had some phase of Imperialism for its theme. What do we mean by this word? Does it stand for a sentiment merely? Do we thereby imply simply that we are pleased to recall our kinship with the races that contributed to the making of the mighty British fabric? Does it signify nothing more than that we are proud of the rock—a very conglomerate rock—out of which we were hewn? Does it remind us of the flag that braved a thousand years the battle and the breeze? Does it help us to contemplate in imagination what would happen if that flag were humbled, and defiled and shorn of its rich heritage of power? Does it recall to us Canadians the grand refusal and the grand choice which, once made in an hour of crisis, was to keep Canada loyal to that ancient flag, after preparing a home for the founders of Ontario and other exiles for conscience' sake? Does it keep us faithful to the traditions which (as Dr.

Scadding reminded us) made the letters U.E.L. so fraught with meaning as an anticipation, in the night of gloom and seeming abandonment, of the splendid noontide of Imperial power and prosperity?

Quick, indeed, with all these heirlooms of memory is the word Imperialism. But it has also a substantial, a practical meaning even for those who are prone to misunderstand it. Let us ask first what meaning it may have, in seeming and in reality, for our French-Canadian fellow-countrymen. In his admirable address on French-Canadian Patriotism, delivered on the 27th of April last, in the Monument National, Montreal, Mr. Henri Bourassa, M.P., asks: "If the treaty of Paris had preserved us to France, what would have become of us? Presuming that we should have escaped the bloody reign of the Terror, it is more than likely that Napoleon would have sold us to the Americans, as he sold the people of Louisiana. And if we had survived the Empire, how could we have accommodated ourselves to the present régime in France? We have preserved, more than our brethren on the other side of the Atlantic, our character as Normans, as sons of Northern France. Instinctively we hate centralization, over-organization, legal militarism, and all that goes to constitute the essentially Imperialist régime that Bonaparte gave to modern France, and which the third Republic has maintained in all its integrity."

Now there is much in the foregoing passage with which the patriotic British-Canadian can cordially sympathize. Clearly Mr. Bourassa does not covet restoration to either Bourbon or post-revolutionary France. As for the re-establishment on this continent of a New France, independent and free, he admits that the picture is attractive, but knows that it is only a dream. Duty insists that Canadians should make Canada the centre of their hopes and efforts. But, while they should avoid wounding the susceptibilities of their British fellow-citizens, they should resist any attempt at the political ab-