

certainly desire to see, whatever we may think of increased taxes against other countries—if we further glance for a moment at what may be called the patriotic or sentimental argument, which is made to do yeoman service in this discussion. It is claimed that "the members of the same great family should trade with each other on better terms than with the foreigner." "Should they not rather," we are asked, "send their goods and money to their own people than to foreign lands?" That depends, one might say, upon our theory of trade—upon the motives and objects of the trader. Most of us have probably known persons who would sooner trade with strangers than with their own friends and relations, because they felt freer to get the best terms possible from strangers. If the thing proposed is, as Col. Vincent tells us elsewhere, a purely business matter, the question of relationship has evidently no place in the argument. We have no doubt that both nations and individuals would be lifted to a much higher plane of life if a large admixture of lofty sentiment, or philanthropy, could be brought into their business transactions. But for the present and for some time to come the old law of supply and demand, the buy-in-the-cheapest-and-sell-in-the-dearest-market principle will, we fear, obtain in both Great Britain and the Colonies. Each will continue to consult simply her own interests. It would be putting the loyalty of either to a crucial test to ask that in selling she should accept a lower, or in buying pay a higher price, because of the family relationship and the old flag. No doubt England is just as selfish in her free trade policy as Canada in her protectionism. It must be admitted, nevertheless, that such a proposal as that of the United Empire Trade League comes with a better grace from Col. Vincent, as a representative of Great Britain, than from Sir Charles Tupper, as a representative of Canada. Were we ourselves English, as we are Canadian, we fear that the temptation would be to us irresistible to say, "Great Britain has done her part. Her trade is as free as it can be. Let Canada follow suit, and the thing will be done."

THE address delivered last winter by Mr. J. G. Bourinot, before the American Historical Association at Washington, on the subject of "Canada and the United States," has, we are glad to see, been published by that body, and thus given a permanent place on its records. Mr. Bourinot's paper is "an Historical Retrospect" of the growth and development of Canada, especially in its relations to the United States, since the history of the two peoples practically began with the triumph of Wolfe on the Plains of Abraham, one hundred and thirty years ago. In the true historical spirit Mr. Bourinot recognizes at the outset that the conflict which had been going on in America for a century or more before that eventful day was really "a conflict of antagonistic principles—the principle of self-government and freedom of thought, against the principle of centralization and the repression of personal liberty." In the same spirit he touches other epoch-making events in the course of the subsequent history. The true meaning of the Quebec Act of 1774, for example, and its obvious intention, are seen to have been "to confine the old English colonies to the country on the Atlantic coast," and to conciliate "the new subjects" of England by enlarging the sphere of the French régime. He thus points out what no one who has read the debates which took place in the British Parliament prior to the passage of that Act can doubt, viz., that the passage of the Quebec Act was as much a hostile message to the thirteen colonies as a charter of the political and religious freedom of the Canadian French. The migration into Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Upper Canada of forty thousand United Empire Loyalists is briefly but effectually dealt with as another of the pregnant events which at critical periods had much to do with determining the destiny of Canada. In touching upon the days of "family compactism" and the rebellion, it may be doubted whether Mr. Bourinot gives sufficient credit to the rash Papineau and the "little, peppery Scotchman of the name of MacKenzie," for the services they rendered the country by their impetuosity, in hastening the advent of representative government and colonial freedom. It may be true that "sooner or later the questions at issue must have found a satisfactory solution" by constitutional methods, but it must not be forgotten that the struggle had been long continued by such methods without much progress having been made, and that to these rash patriots it is unquestionably due that the great reforms came sooner rather than later—possibly very

much later. Thus it often happens in history that posterity condemns the agitator while it reaps the fruits of the agitation. In dealing with the difficulties which have from time to time arisen between Canada and the United States, or, more strictly speaking, between Great Britain and the United States on Canadian questions, the sketch gives evidence, not only of careful study of the facts, but of thoughtful regard to the less obvious causes lying behind them. Mr. Bourinot's well-known power of clear and effective statement is manifest throughout. It is true that to the Republican reader who, on his part, has studied the questions from an opposite view-point, and under the influence of different national sympathies, the retrospect of boundary transactions, fishery disputes, abortive trade negotiations, etc., may seem open to criticism as having been written in the patriotic rather than the judicial spirit. It may be questioned whether Mr. Bourinot has always shown that power of putting himself in his neighbour's place which is characteristic of the historical spirit in its highest development. It is indeed scarcely probable that the Canadian authorities have been quite so uniformly right and reasonable, and those of the United States quite so uniformly wrong and unreasonable, as the tract might lead the cursory reader to suppose. But as a paper read by a loyal Canadian before a United States' Historical Society, and now reprinted by that Society for the benefit of American readers, it is admirably adapted to set before our neighbours the Canadian view of questions which many of them may never before have seen in any other light than that of their own strong national prejudices.

HONORE MERCIER, Count of the Holy Roman Empire, etc., etc., has returned from Europe loaded with honours and decorations, and his coming has been hailed by his impressionable fellow-citizens as that of a conquering hero. Notwithstanding all that has been said and hinted, there seems no longer room to doubt that he has succeeded in obtaining a temporary loan of four millions of dollars on fairly reasonable terms. With this he will be able to tide the Province over the threatened financial crisis. Nor do we know any sufficient reason for doubting that he may be able, at the close of another session, should the money market become more favourable, to secure the permanent loan of ten thousand which will be needed in the near future. The question whether the unfortunate financial strait in which the Province of Quebec finds itself is mainly due to Premier Mercier's own extravagance and bad management, or to those of his predecessors, or to causes beyond the control of either, is, strictly speaking, a matter of Provincial concern, with which we are not called upon to meddle. It is obviously true, however, that from another point of view, that of the peculiar relations of the Province to the Dominion, the question is one of deep interest to all Canadians. Sooner or later, and probably very soon, the demand for better terms, not only from Quebec, but from other impecunious members of the Confederation, must become again irresistible. The only consolation, in view of such a contingency, is that the sooner these demands are forced upon the consideration of the general Government and Parliament, the sooner, in all probability, will all parties be convinced of the necessity of agreeing upon a better financial system and reaching a settlement which shall be really and truly a finality. But into these serious matters we need not now enter more fully. The object of this paragraph was to give expression to our honest wonder to what extent the new-made Count really values his numerous titles and badges as having an intrinsic virtue, or as honest tributes to modest merit, and to what extent he covets and uses them as bits of tinsel with which to dazzle and captivate the admiring crowd. Recognizing his undoubted shrewdness, one can hardly help suspecting that he is laughing in his sleeve while receiving the plaudits of the populace. Of course this fondness for titles and decorations and richly-coloured garments is not peculiar to Premier Mercier any more than is the homage paid to them to his French compatriots. One need not cross the Ottawa, or even quit the City of Toronto on certain gala days, to witness—but there, we are trenching upon unsafe ground, and had better turn aside at once. "People do love badges!" exclaimed a philosopher the other day.

MR. CAMERON (of Huron) may be congratulated on the prospective success of his Bill to permit the accused in criminal cases to testify on his own behalf. Though the measure is set aside for the present, the attitude of the Minister of Justice may be accepted as a

guarantee that the principle for which Mr. Cameron has so persistently contended will be incorporated in Canadian criminal law in the near future. So far as that principle itself is concerned, it is hard to understand why it should have to be contended for at this advanced stage in the science of jurisprudence. If the paramount consideration in the judicial enquiry is, as Sir John Thompson said, to ascertain the truth—a proposition whose contradictory is absurd—it is difficult to conceive of any valid reason why the only individual in the world who, in the majority of cases, knows the whole truth, should be prevented from testifying. The strongest reason that can be suggested for the anomaly, the prevention of perjury, to which Sir John referred, seems strangely weak and would hardly bear serious investigation. The Minister pointed out, however, many difficulties touching matters both of principle and of detail, with which the proposed innovation is beset, and in view of these Parliament was no doubt wise in preferring to make haste slowly. In view of the differences of opinion between jurists and other high legal authorities in regard not only to the general principle, but to minor questions of procedure, it may be presumptuous in a journalist, or other layman, to so much as venture an opinion. And yet it does seem passing strange that there should be any difference of opinion as to whether either the accused or a wife should be permitted to testify. The question as to whether either or both should be compelled to do so is one of much greater difficulty. In cases in which the offence charged is one involving capital punishment it is not easy to see how the accused could be compelled to testify, since imprisonment, the severest punishment to which he could, on refusal, be subjected, would be less dreadful to most than the penalty which would follow confession or proof of guilt. It is impossible not to feel that to compel a truthful wife to testify against a husband whom she knew to be guilty would appear to be, in many cases, positively cruel; yet, even so, it can hardly be denied that the best interests of society, involved in the discovery of the truth, should be deemed paramount to those of any individual. On the other hand it is easy to conceive of hundreds of cases in which the straightforward testimony of either the accused or his wife might prevent the conviction of an innocent man and the commission of a grave judicial wrong. The strange case of the couple arrested a few days since at Fairbank, charged with the murder of their daughter, will at once suggest itself to many as one in which it would be most desirable from every point of view that both should be permitted to testify. Very few prisoners would, in such circumstances, hesitate to do so, as hesitation would be sure to be interpreted as an admission, though of course it would not be legal proof, of guilt.

"MY aim is, above all, the maintenance of peace," declared the Emperor of Germany during his recent visit to England. We have already been constrained to admit that his method of maintaining peace, by dint of enormous armies, has been for a time successful in preventing actual conflict, and may prove so for some time to come. And an armed peace is incomparably better, from some points of view, than horrid war. It is quite possible, too, that the agreement, of whatever nature it may be, that was reached during the conferences of the Emperor and his Secretary of State with Lord Salisbury, may still further prolong peace, by counteracting Franco-Russian projects against British possessions in the East. But withal it must be confessed that even the blessings of a peace so maintained are terrible to contemplate. And then, again, whatever may be the case with the Triple Alliance itself, it is evident that any alliance, or undertaking, that can be entered into by a British Prime Minister without the sanction of Parliament is really a very precarious affair. It is doubly precarious in this case, by reason of the uncertain tenure by which Lord Salisbury now retains office, as evidenced by the result of the latest bye-elections. Still further, though on the whole the renewal of the Triple Alliance may be matter for congratulation, the necessity which called for it, if such there be, is to be deplored, because, in addition to many other strong reasons, it renders reduction of European armaments practically impossible, during the years for which it is to stand. An English writer, who witnessed the pageant in London, points out the singular incongruity between the Emperor's professed love of peace, which was explained to mean "progress, friendly intercourse, and the advancement of civilization," and the warlike pageantry which surrounded him at every step of his progress, even in the