

THE WEEKLY BRITISH COLONIST.

VOL. 11. VICTORIA, VANCOUVER ISLAND, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1870. NO. 37

THE BRITISH COLONIST
PUBLISHED DAILY BY
DAVID W. HIGGINS

TERMS:
Six Months, in advance, \$10 00
Three Months, do, 5 00
One Month, do, 1 50
One Week, do, 25

WEEKLY BRITISH COLONIST
PUBLISHED WEDNESDAY MORNING.

TERMS:
One Year, in advance, \$20 00
Six Months, do, 10 00
Three Months, do, 5 00
One Week, do, 25

AGENTS:
S. D. Levi, Vancouver, B. C.
G. & J. Clarke, New Westminster
S. D. Levi, Victoria, B. C.

OFFICE:—Colony Building, Government and Langley
1414, adjoining Bank of British Columbia.

The New Map.
For long have the Napoleons claimed to be regarded as *par excellence* the map-makers of Europe—a pretension which, although, perhaps, not altogether without foundation, is little likely to survive the present war. The last attempt of a Napoleon at map-making has proved such a wretched failure—as inflicted such a blot upon the bright escutcheon of France that it is likely to prove the end of arrogant assumption. But that there will be a reconstruction of central Europe as the immediate result of the present war—may we not venture to say the late war—can scarcely be doubted. Napoleon sought this war for the object of bolstering up a

is quite powerful enough and formidable enough already. France and Prussia will never get on peaceably as next door neighbors. They have not done so in the past; and they would most assuredly not be more likely to do so in the future, were the latter permitted to make Alsace and Lorraine Prussian by force, as the result of war. Such an arrangement would, in reality, render the peace of Europe less assured than ever. What, then, is to be done? If Prussia is to be content with mere indemnification in the money expenses of a war which has cost hundreds of thousands of her best sons, a war into which she was most unjustly forced, and in which her successes have placed her in a position to dictate terms? Certainly not. It has been seen that the acquisition of Alsace and Lorraine would, to say the least, be a doubtful good to Prussia and an element of danger to Europe. Let these provinces, together with Luxemburg, be added to the Belgium, and let the independence and neutrality of that kingdom be guaranteed by all the European Powers. Thus there would be intervening between France and Prussia an independent and neutral kingdom with a territorial area of twenty-five thousand square miles and a Franco-German population of eight millions—at once a pledge of the peace of Europe and the maintenance of the balance of power. To such an arrangement France would scarcely be entitled to object, at least as matters stand at the present time; Prussia would not object, and all the Great Powers might be presumed willingly to consent. With such an arrangement Europe might partially, at least, disarm.

The Tariff Question Again.
In his issue of yesterday our local contemporary returns to the subject of the Customs Tariffs, and reiterates its absurd proposition to meet foreign productions with a differential duty of 50 per cent, asserting that for our Legislature to make such an arrangement is a violation to the most ordinary intellect, that to clog the Terms with any new conditions would be to render less negotiations necessary and consequently to render delay inevitable. This would be the case even if the new conditions were admissible, which they certainly are not. We would not wish to be understood as taking the position that the country should unquestioningly accept the Terms agreed upon between the two Governments purely on the ground of avoiding delay. What we wish to say is that the people would not be consulting their true interests in incurring delay for a questionable good which the Dominion Government will never concede. In negotiating the Terms, probably no subject received more careful, earnest and exhaustive discussion than that underlying the whole question of Customs Tariffs, and the Delegates really brought back the only choice that could be conceded in this matter. The editor of the *Standard* is never without his hobby when an election is near. A year ago it was a special tariff; and he went the length of announcing his determination to oppose any Terms which did not give the people of British Columbia power to regulate their own tariffs. Now he has abandoned that hobby, and trotted out another equally absurd. But our contemporary will find little sympathy either in town or country. The feeling is very general against reopening the question of Terms and thereby postponing union indefinitely, especially for the sake of arguing upon the consideration of the Ottawa Cabinet a concession which cannot be made—a concession regarding the utility of which the colonists themselves are by no means agreed. The allusion, in the beginning of the article in question, to the eagerness of some to grasp the 'loaves and fishes' of office vividly suggests to one's mind the memorable words of Burns:

The *Standard* is never without his hobby when an election is near. A year ago it was a special tariff; and he went the length of announcing his determination to oppose any Terms which did not give the people of British Columbia power to regulate their own tariffs. Now he has abandoned that hobby, and trotted out another equally absurd. But our contemporary will find little sympathy either in town or country. The feeling is very general against reopening the question of Terms and thereby postponing union indefinitely, especially for the sake of arguing upon the consideration of the Ottawa Cabinet a concession which cannot be made—a concession regarding the utility of which the colonists themselves are by no means agreed. The allusion, in the beginning of the article in question, to the eagerness of some to grasp the 'loaves and fishes' of office vividly suggests to one's mind the memorable words of Burns:

The *Standard* is never without his hobby when an election is near. A year ago it was a special tariff; and he went the length of announcing his determination to oppose any Terms which did not give the people of British Columbia power to regulate their own tariffs. Now he has abandoned that hobby, and trotted out another equally absurd. But our contemporary will find little sympathy either in town or country. The feeling is very general against reopening the question of Terms and thereby postponing union indefinitely, especially for the sake of arguing upon the consideration of the Ottawa Cabinet a concession which cannot be made—a concession regarding the utility of which the colonists themselves are by no means agreed. The allusion, in the beginning of the article in question, to the eagerness of some to grasp the 'loaves and fishes' of office vividly suggests to one's mind the memorable words of Burns:

SUNDAY'S DISPATCHES.
London, Sept 5.—It is reported that the investing army on the receipt of the news of Napoleon's surrender, has been disbanded at Chigny, 12 miles southeast of Metz, and been led to the village of Metz, where they were quartered. The investing army on the receipt of the news of Napoleon's surrender, has been disbanded at Chigny, 12 miles southeast of Metz, and been led to the village of Metz, where they were quartered. The investing army on the receipt of the news of Napoleon's surrender, has been disbanded at Chigny, 12 miles southeast of Metz, and been led to the village of Metz, where they were quartered.

ent he contemplated territorial aggrandisement the world is uninformed; but it is questionable whether, in the event of that brilliant success upon which he appears to have reckoned, he would have been content with making the Rhine the eastern boundary of France. Indeed, it is no secret that not long before the war he spoke very significantly of the French-speaking Cantons of Switzerland, and declared that in Piedmont it was impossible to decide where French ended and Italian began! But Napoleon's views in map-making lose much of their importance with the termination of his power to carry them into effect. It now concerns the world more to know Bismarck's views. Reading his intentions in the dim and uncertain light of electricity, his territorial ambition would appear to be bounded by the Voiges. Will the Great Powers consent to the acquisition of Alsace and Lorraine by Prussia? It is intimated that Austria and Russia object, but that Great Britain favors the arrangement. Whatever claims Prussia might be presumed to possess, we should regret if such were to be the territorial result of the present war. It should be the earnest aim, as it is the undoubted right, of the Great Powers to make such territorial adjustments as will secure the peace and make this the last, as it has been the most wanton and bloody European war. How is this to be attained? Not by giving Alsace and Lorraine to Prussia. It is in the interest and for the peace of Prussia herself that these provinces should not be added to her territory, for they would form an element of weakness and interest. These provinces—more French than German in language and feeling—would never become Prussian in heart. In 1864 Prussian earth-hunger led her too far North. Holstein was not altogether undesirable. Valuable in itself and as a means of rounding off her territorial symmetry, its people were, perhaps, more German than Danish in heart and tongue. But in Schleswig every one of these conditions was more or less wanting; and the consequence is that Schleswig forms an element of weakness and discontent in the north. And so it would be with Alsace and Lorraine. Regarding the subject from the broader and more important standpoint, still stronger reasons will be discovered why the Great Powers should object to the absorption of these provinces by Prussia. Such an arrangement, so far from promoting the peace of Europe and preserving the "balance of power," would greatly tend to endanger both. Prussia has enough of territory—rather more, as has been seen, than is good for her, and rather more than she had just claim to. She

to point out what must be perfectly obvious to the most ordinary intellect, that to clog the Terms with any new conditions would be to render less negotiations necessary and consequently to render delay inevitable. This would be the case even if the new conditions were admissible, which they certainly are not. We would not wish to be understood as taking the position that the country should unquestioningly accept the Terms agreed upon between the two Governments purely on the ground of avoiding delay. What we wish to say is that the people would not be consulting their true interests in incurring delay for a questionable good which the Dominion Government will never concede. In negotiating the Terms, probably no subject received more careful, earnest and exhaustive discussion than that underlying the whole question of Customs Tariffs, and the Delegates really brought back the only choice that could be conceded in this matter. The editor of the *Standard* is never without his hobby when an election is near. A year ago it was a special tariff; and he went the length of announcing his determination to oppose any Terms which did not give the people of British Columbia power to regulate their own tariffs. Now he has abandoned that hobby, and trotted out another equally absurd. But our contemporary will find little sympathy either in town or country. The feeling is very general against reopening the question of Terms and thereby postponing union indefinitely, especially for the sake of arguing upon the consideration of the Ottawa Cabinet a concession which cannot be made—a concession regarding the utility of which the colonists themselves are by no means agreed. The allusion, in the beginning of the article in question, to the eagerness of some to grasp the 'loaves and fishes' of office vividly suggests to one's mind the memorable words of Burns:

The *Standard* is never without his hobby when an election is near. A year ago it was a special tariff; and he went the length of announcing his determination to oppose any Terms which did not give the people of British Columbia power to regulate their own tariffs. Now he has abandoned that hobby, and trotted out another equally absurd. But our contemporary will find little sympathy either in town or country. The feeling is very general against reopening the question of Terms and thereby postponing union indefinitely, especially for the sake of arguing upon the consideration of the Ottawa Cabinet a concession which cannot be made—a concession regarding the utility of which the colonists themselves are by no means agreed. The allusion, in the beginning of the article in question, to the eagerness of some to grasp the 'loaves and fishes' of office vividly suggests to one's mind the memorable words of Burns:

The *Standard* is never without his hobby when an election is near. A year ago it was a special tariff; and he went the length of announcing his determination to oppose any Terms which did not give the people of British Columbia power to regulate their own tariffs. Now he has abandoned that hobby, and trotted out another equally absurd. But our contemporary will find little sympathy either in town or country. The feeling is very general against reopening the question of Terms and thereby postponing union indefinitely, especially for the sake of arguing upon the consideration of the Ottawa Cabinet a concession which cannot be made—a concession regarding the utility of which the colonists themselves are by no means agreed. The allusion, in the beginning of the article in question, to the eagerness of some to grasp the 'loaves and fishes' of office vividly suggests to one's mind the memorable words of Burns:

The *Standard* is never without his hobby when an election is near. A year ago it was a special tariff; and he went the length of announcing his determination to oppose any Terms which did not give the people of British Columbia power to regulate their own tariffs. Now he has abandoned that hobby, and trotted out another equally absurd. But our contemporary will find little sympathy either in town or country. The feeling is very general against reopening the question of Terms and thereby postponing union indefinitely, especially for the sake of arguing upon the consideration of the Ottawa Cabinet a concession which cannot be made—a concession regarding the utility of which the colonists themselves are by no means agreed. The allusion, in the beginning of the article in question, to the eagerness of some to grasp the 'loaves and fishes' of office vividly suggests to one's mind the memorable words of Burns: