

or to be absorbed by their stronger neighbors and thus become alienated from, and the opponents of, the parent land, was a matter with which these large hearted patriots did not trouble themselves. Assuming that the colonies, and especially that Canada, was a source of weakness to the Empire, dreading the effect upon trade of any complications with the United States and looking at the question from a purely economic point of view, they were sought to be gotten rid of as speedily as possible. And time and again the mighty but often mistaken Thunderer has assumed the attitude of Benediction, and with uplifted hands and tremulous voice has been ready to say "Depart in peace!"

The natural and necessary result of all this has been that we have been both grieved and humbled, and true to our native born instincts we have indicated our readiness to accept the situation. Any other feeling would have been unworthy our Anglo-Saxon origin, and discreditable to the proud and high spirited people from which we have sprung. We are proud of nationality, and feel to be united to Great Britain by the affinities and sympathies of race, language, literature, religion, interest, and rule, is an honor not lightly to be thrown away. Her fleets ride triumphant in every sea, her Colonies girdle the earth, her literature is read by the learned in all lands, her political institutions are admired by the friends of freedom everywhere, her morning gun awakens to activity a fifth of the human family, while over every seventh acre of earth her flag is floating to day. Separation is not of our seeking; we have never desired, but have always opposed it; we have advocated the upholding of the integrity of the Empire, and have ever been willing to bear our full share of the burdens and responsibilities involved thereby. For nearly a hundred years there has been a standing invitation to enter the American Union, and many and various have been the reasons urged, the arguments presented for our acceptance of the same, but we have never encouraged such a course. By our strongly expressed sympathy for the Mother Country in her times of trouble, by the promptitude with which we have responded to the appeal to repel the invader, by the reception we gave her soldiers who came to fight for imperial rather than Colonial interests; and by the readiness with which our Legislatures pledged the resources of the country for the common weal, we have unmistakably declared our wish and will. And if a contrary opinion has ever been entertained, the blame, if blame there be, is wholly chargeable to a few weak-kneed politicians of the Manchester School.

And with us upon this subject the great mass of the British people are in full accord, and very few of them have been won over to the ranks of the Separationists. Indeed no policy could be more distasteful to them, and no amount of special pleading could ever make it popular. It is the boast of the Briton that he can go to the ends of the earth and yet be at home, and that he is everywhere under the shadow and protection of the Red Cross banner. He remembers what his country was before the dawning of the Colonial era, and is afraid that cooped up within the narrow limits of the British Isles, her greatness, her glory, and her prestige would pass away. And so general and strongly pronounced is this feeling, that a Ministry believed to favour the casting adrift of the Colonies would be hurled from power, as guilty of the gravest offence, and meriting the severest censure. But how is this connection to be kept up,

and what relation are the Colonies to sustain to the Mother Country. That "something will have to be done" is evident, but what that something ought to be is not so easy to be determined. The Reorganization of the Empire must and will become the great question of the near future, in the presence of which all others will pale away, requiring time, patience, lofty patriotism, and enlightened statesmanship for its satisfactory settlement. The task will undoubtedly be a difficult one, many an obstacle will have to be removed, many a prejudice overcome, and many a concession made. Many a battle will be fought both in and out of Parliament, many a side issue will be brought in, and all the old arguments against Confederation together with a multitude of new ones will be reproduced and brought to bear against it. Many a dark and dismal prophecy will be uttered, the bugbear of taxation and ruin will be presented, and the support of the Army, the Navy, the Royal Family, &c., will be made the theme of many an oration. But grave and serious as may be the difficulties to be grappled with, we have full faith in the ability of the British people to overcome them all when the time for action arrives. In the meantime, things are working favorably, the question is being calmly and thoughtfully considered, and proposals are being submitted, the public mind is being familiarized with the subject, the colonies are being grouped into Confederations, and the way is gradually but surely being opened up for the realization of this magnificent idea.

Quite in harmony with the foregoing views, is a speech recently delivered before the Edinburgh Philosophical Association by the Rt. Hon. W. E. Forster M. P., on "our Colonial Empire;" the perusal of which has afforded us very great pleasure. Such a subject, before such an audience, and by such a man, could not fail to be deeply interesting, and the notice that has been taken of it by the British press, is a strong endorsement of its doctrines. We have no time now to review it, but will simply say that it was worthy the man and the subject, and content ourselves with quoting the closing paragraph:—

"If there be one fact more evident than another in that page of the history of humanity that is now being written, it is the strength of what we may call the natal force, the tendency, the longing of men speaking one tongue to bind themselves together in a common nationality. But remember that, with the exception of ourselves, this tendency is making itself felt in the creation and maintenance of enormous standing armies. It would appear as though the nations of Europe suppose that they can only hold themselves from disruption by being armed camps. Now turn to the other fact peculiar to ourselves. Our islands are so well situated for colonizing, the inhabitants so industrious, so persevering, so gifted—in a word, with the colonizing faculty, we have encircled the earth by the free and orderly communities we have founded. Remember also that if these communities remain united they are so strong in their inherited courage, and are so quickly increasing in strength, and that it will matter not to any one of them how easily soever these armed and drilled nations also may grow. Remember also that science has brought together the ends of the earth and made it possible for a nation to have oceans roll between its provinces. Why then should we, alone among the nations, set ourselves against that desire for nationality which is one of the most powerful ideas of the age? What right

have we to entail on the men of our race the danger and disadvantages of disunion? Why should we reject the gifts of science and neglect these possibilities of union which steam and electricity afford. The time is come that all Governments—even military and despotic Governments—must, without delay, do what their subjects wish. Can, we not, by the example of peaceful union, tempt subjects to induce their Governments to disarm? May not we and our colonists together, by the exercise of some mutual forbearance, by willingness to incur some mutual sacrifice, hope to transform our colonial empire into a federation of peaceful, industrious, law-abiding commonwealths, so that in due time our British brotherhood may prove to the world as no nation has ever proved before. 'How good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.'"—*Frederickton Reporter*, December 1.

Origin of the Title of "Admiral."

A discussion having arisen in France as to the origin of the word "Admiral," it has been proved beyond doubt, says the *London Daily News*, that St. Louis, who introduced that title into France, borrowed it from the Arab *amir al bahr*, which signifies chief or commander of the sea.

The rank of Admiral was formerly equivalent to that of Marshal of France, and a decree of Philippe-le-Bel ordains that "each wing of an army must be commanded by a Prince, an Admiral, or a Marshal." It also constituted the fourth dignity of the Order of Malta. The Admirals of France formerly possessed such great prerogatives that Richelieu suppressed the title, and invested himself with their functions under the name of Grand Master, Chief, and Superintendent General of Navigation and Commerce. Louis XIV. revived the rank of Grand Admiral in 1669, but he reserved to himself the nomination of officers. Notwithstanding these restrictions, the privileges attaching to this post were still enormous (comprising the nomination of the officers belonging to the naval courts of justice, the delivery of passports, permissions, and furloughs, the countersigning of the royal decrees, and the receipt of a tithe upon all prize money and fines levied by the Admiralty Courts). So valuable were these privileges, that when the Duc de Penthièvre abandoned his claims to them in 1759, he received in compensation an annual grant of £6,000, which was regularly paid until the Revolution.

The first Admiral of France was Florent de Varennes, who, appointed by St. Louis, accompanied his sovereign in the expedition to Tunis, and since his day down to 1791, when the title of Admiral of France or Sea Admiral—which is quite distinct from that of General of the Gallies—was abolished by the National Assembly, it was conferred upon fifty nine different personages. The most celebrated of these naval commanders were Nicolas Béluchet, who seized Portsmouth in 1339; Jean de Vienne, Seigneur de Clairvaux, who was killed at the battle of Nicopolis; Gaspard, Comte de Coligny, a victim of the St. Bartholomew; Anne de Joyeuse, one of the most devoted adherents of Henri III., killed at the battle of Coutras; François de Coligny, the eldest son of the murdered Admiral; Charles de Goutant, Duc de Biron, the trusted councillor of Henry IV., who was afterwards beheaded for high treason; Henry II., Duc de Montmorency and de Damville, Governor of Languedoc, also beheaded for high treason and François de