

the top of its limit and yet failed to keep its subjects on these barren islands. Therefore, it is absurd to a degree that either the French or the British should wish to maintain a status quo at once financially burdensome to the one and an embargo upon the full territorial dominancy of the other. With the present cordial relations existing between the two nations, crystallized as they were last year by an arbitration treaty, it seems to us that the Governments of Canada and Newfoundland have a most favourable opportunity to press the home Government for the opening of negotiations, looking to a surrender by France of her "treaty shore" rights, and the sale of her title to the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon. By such a consummation Canada and Newfoundland would be greatly benefited even under existing political conditions; but with confederation *fait accompli* the advantages of it could not be easily measured.

There is this further argument in favour of the acquisition of these several portions of contiguous territory by Canada, namely, that by no reasonable extension of the Monroe doctrine can the Government of the United States object to any part of the proceeding. It is true that President Polk's gloss upon the now famous doctrine enunciated by his predecessor Monroe, at the suggestion of the English statesman Canning, has been interpreted to mean that any European power would have to obtain the consent of the United States to any acquisition of dominion in the Americas whether by voluntary cession, or transfer, or by conquest (see Dana's Notes to Wheaton's Elements, p. 102; Taylor's International Law, p. 146). But Canada does not come within the letter or spirit of this inhibition, and the burden that might rest upon Great Britain, were she purchasing *sua causa*, of establishing that this inhibition is no part of the code of international law or that Great Britain is herself an American power and so not within the inhibition even if it were valid, would not be raised in the matter of territorial expansion here advocated.

If our view is a correct one, the expediency of prompt action in the premises by those in authority needs no demonstration.