

REFLECTIONS

MR. RICHARD JEBB suggests that the Imperial Government should appoint a Canadian as the Empire's ambassador at Washington. Mr. Jebb is the author of a book entitled "Studies in Colonial Nationalism," in which he exhibits definite

CANADA AT WASHINGTON

sympathy with the colonial view of Imperial questions. He was in Canada last winter for a time and has an intimate knowledge of nearly all His Majesty's important Dominions Over Seas. He is on the staff of the "Morning Post" of London, and makes his suggestion in that journal. The "Daily Mail" takes it up editorially and approves.

Canada must be pardoned if she declines the great honour which these London journalists thus dare to thrust upon her. We desire to play a considerable part in the Empire's affairs and are willing to lend our services wherever we think they may be useful. For a Canadian to go to Washington and take up all the work of British diplomacy at that point would be foolish. In much of it we are not interested. No Canadian has had the necessary training. These are two good and sufficient reasons.

If the British Government will appoint a Canadian as first secretary to the British ambassador, that would be quite sufficient to satisfy Canadian pride and to safeguard Canadian interests. Such an appointment would be more reasonable. But, perhaps Mr. Jebb and the editor of the "Daily Mail" are simply poking fun at us and our aspirations.

ONCE more there is a revolution in France, albeit there are wanting gunpowder and sabres. On Tuesday next, France will see the greatest civil change since the days of the Provisional Government, when the Roman Catholic Church will cease in any form to be a State Church. When **FRANCE'S RELIGIOUS REVOLUTION** a hundred and five years ago, Napoleon compelled the Pope to assent to the Concordat, his object was to keep the fabric of the Church—saturated with Royalism, as he believed—safely under his control. The Concordat has subsisted ever since, the changes made having been unessential. It was the sequel to the persecuting policy instituted by Mirabeau, and Napoleon, feeling the necessity for religious peace, also foresaw the credit which would be his could he restore the illegal altars and nominate the bishops. The Papacy fought hard for complete liberty, but Bonaparte, as Chief of State, insisted upon the compromise under which Rome relinquished all claim to the Church lands sequestered during the revolution. On its part, the Government of the Republic recognized "the Catholic Apostolic and Roman faith to be the religion of the great majority of French Citizens"—as well as of the Consuls. All of the French Bishops were to resign, or to be deposed if they refused, and Bonaparte was to nominate the succeeding bishops fairly from both parties. The State was to pay bishops and cures. All of these promises were not carried out, but the Concordat, signed in 1801, has existed through Consulate, Empire, three Kingdoms, another Empire, and two Republics. The Clemenceau administration on Tuesday will finally seize the Church property, which for a year will remain in sequestration. What will happen to it afterwards is "on the knees of the gods."

The Separation Law is primarily the outcome of a conviction that the Associations, i.e., the religious

orders, are largely anti-Republican and have been plotting against the State. This seems at this distance an exaggerated view of a possible danger, for the Republic seems as firmly grounded in France as limited Monarchy is in England. M. Briand, the Minister of Public Worship in announcing the Government's decision to seize the Church property, remarked that "the State owes nothing to the Catholics but the liberty of public worship." The State-paid stipends are to end; the tithes have gone, and in France for the first time since the lurid days of Danton and Robespierre, Marat and Mirabeau, there will be no State Church.

THE chief feature of the new tariff of 1906, is the introduction of a middle tariff, one standing between the British preference on the one side and the general tariff on the other. This intermediate rate is to come into force only on Executive motion. In other words, Canada is to adopt lower duties only as the result of a bargain. A few examples will show the complicity of our schedules and their general character:

	Br. Pref.	Inter.	Gen.
Canned meats	17½	25	27½
Prepared Cereal Foods	15	17½	20
Books, unbound	15	22½	25
Books, bound	5	10	10
Newspapers and periodicals	Free	Free	Free
Perfumery	25	32½	35
Tinware	15	22½	25
Steel rails, per ton	\$4.50	\$6.00	\$7.50
Iron or steel bridges	22½	30	35
Harvesters	12½	17½	17½

The German surtax remains and the iron and steel bounties will be retained until 1910.

IN 1849, the general duties on imported goods were twelve and a half per cent; in 1856 this was increased to fifteen per cent.; in 1858 it was further increased to twenty per cent. In the latter tariff, boots and shoes, harness, saddlery and clothing, paid twenty-five per cent. In 1866, the rate went back to fifteen per cent. In 1874 this was increased to seventeen and a half per cent. In all these tariffs there was of course a large free list. Under the 1874 tariff wheat, flour, oatmeal, coal, salt, steel rails and flax were free and large quantities of these were imported. In 1876, a select committee reported against an increase in duties as likely to lead to a loss in revenue, and to an increase in the cost of manufactured goods to the consumer. Two years later, however, the "National Policy" of Sir John Macdonald caused the defeat of the MacKenzie-Cartwright Government and the tariff of 1879 raised the general rate to thirty per cent. Canada had decided to "create a home market for the products of home labour."

Since 1879, Canada has had a moderately protectional tariff. In 1882 the opposition supported a motion of Hon. (now Sir) Wilfrid Laurier, looking to the repeal of the duties on coal, coke and breadstuffs. But the vote stood 120 to 47. These articles had formerly been free. In 1893, the Liberals met at Ottawa under the leadership of Laurier, Mowat, Cartwright and others and declared that the Customs Tariff "should not be based upon the protective principle but upon the requirements of the public service."

When the Liberal party came into power in 1896,