

common markets. Both of these unjust arrangements are inspired by the same views of industrial policy, the same narrow mediæval spirit, which, largely through the example of the United States, now prevails even in the Western world.

The Empire, remaining united, is destined in the end to deliver a death-blow to this system, now so prevalent in the world. Bridging oceans and uniting continents, it will shatter forever all the dreams of isolation and exclusion.

A declaration of the unity of the Empire at this moment may produce a very marked result. When the lines of the British Empire are at last permanently settled, and its future destiny as a girdle around the world established, it will be something that one of the great uncertainties of policy will have been set at rest. The event will be a triumph of the principles which must ultimately work for a general international commercial peace.

Is not the logic of events reinforcing Canada's appeal to Newfoundland to add the coping-stone to the work of North American Confederation, by uniting the North American Colonies, from West to East, into one grand and logical whole; and thereafter joining with Canada, and let us hope with Australasia, in a general declaration of the unity of the Empire?

The present action of Newfoundland imperils common interests. By abandoning her isolated position and temporarily waiving her local interests, she will establish a claim upon the common gratitude. Newfoundland's rights to the complete freedom of her territory will become a first charge upon the diplomacy of the New Empire. The assertion of these rights, Newfoundlanders may be assured, if more timely and temperate, will be not less firm and imperative.

Newfoundlanders need not fear that French-Canadian race sympathies will be found adverse to the interests of the Dominion in any just dealings with France. The inhabitants of Lower Canada are not so much French as they are *Canadians*. A section of the French people, separated in the Seventeenth Century, and already to a great extent abandoned, in the formative period of the previous century—neglected by their mother country, and flung off at the last, like an unvalued jewel—they have grown to be a people, as distinct from that from which they sprang, as the New Englanders of the American Revolution were distinct from the English of the Eighteenth Century. By long isolation, by religion and constitutional experience, they have become a distinct race. Hence, time will find them as united upon the integrity of Canadian interests against France as against every other foreign country. They will be as firm in resenting French abuses upon the coasts of Newfoundland, as if they were attempted on the coast of Gaspé.

It is useless to negotiate with a country at a time when it inclines to desire war rather than peace: when it will concede nothing of its extremest pretensions to mere justice and equity, because it rather cherishes opportunities to quarrel than desires to avoid them.

French Chauvinism now, perhaps, begins to recognize, with unconfessed despair, that—unless a desperate effort is made at once, by any alliances however uncivilized, by any means however savage—the “lost Provinces” are lost indeed; that slowly but certainly they are re-merging into the Germany from which they were first torn, and to which, by race, language and religion, they naturally belong. Disappointment turns an acrid patriotism into fury. Mad with revengeful passion, it is ready to fasten upon the nearest hand.

France is furnishing a lurid illustration of the correctness of a diagnosis quietly recorded a quarter of a century ago by a philosophical observer, himself belonging to the French race, and writing in that language.

“Liberty,” wrote Amiel, in his famous *Journal*, “is not possible without free individuals. Liberty in the individual is the result of a foregoing education. To preach liberalism to a population Jesuitized by education is to press the pleasures of dancing on a man who has lost a leg. How can the abdication of individual conscience lead to the Government of individual consciences? Ultramontane Catholicism never emancipates its disciples, who are bound to admit, to believe and to obey as they are told, because they are minors in perpetuity, and the clergy alone possess the law of right, the secret of justice and the measure of truth.”

Galled by the overstrained bit of Catholicism, a formidably large element in France has flung off altogether the reins of morality. Ungoverned passion is its law. In one direction the flood of Pander literature is its delight (a vile reservoir that has overflowed its native bounds, and now poisons once purer streams on every side). In the political world, Napoleon I. is still its ideal. Thus, the mood of this part of the French people is evil and dangerous.

To keep this undisciplined, impatient mass within bounds is the constant difficulty of French Governments. It threatens their stability. It menaces surrounding Europe. It is almost as near savagery as it was in 1793, when it burst upon surrounding Europe in an inundation of fire and blood.

At such a time the statesmanship of every country owes a duty to humanity. It is no fit moment for presenting irritating claims, however just. The situation resembles that which existed in the United States in 1871, in the presence of which Canada waived the Fenian claims. Diplomacy is once more obliged to respect the difficulties

of a Republican Government, dominated, for the time being, by semi-civilized elements.

Now let us consider what is the moral position of the Empire, at the time it is required to undertake a perilous task in the interest of a single province. Does it supplement its comparative deficiencies as a military power by the prestige of its ultimate prospects? With what authority does Great Britain, our mouthpiece, stand clothed before armed Europe? May she declare herself to be at the head of a vigorous, united and expanding Empire, firmly bound to perpetual mutual constancy, and resolved upon a deliberate and consistent policy?

Or is not the following a truer picture of the facts? Newfoundland, at the moment she is pressing her high demands, is interlarding them with threats of asserting the right of secession from the Imperial Union. Canada, in her temporary agony under the torture-screw of a hostile tariff (applied by the United States, in the true mediæval spirit, to coerce her conscience or extort her wealth), impatient also under her own overstrained tariff (vexatiously administered and attended with rumours of corruption), has just barely escaped flinging her prosperity and independence—in all probability her portion in the future of the Empire—at the mercy of the honour and good faith of the United States. Australia, on the point of forming another great combination of provinces, the foundation-stones of another new nation, debates at the same moment whether the following step shall be towards consolidation with the Empire, or towards complete separation from it.

And what of India? The loyalty of its princes and populations has been growing from year to year. It has been manifested on recent occasions with signal effect. But, even more than the loyalty of the colonies, is it a loyalty of reason and expediency. How would it stand in the presence of a general disintegration? What must be the effect upon it of a universal desertion of Old England by the nations of England's own blood? Will not the first to step out shatter a magic circle? So precarious a thing, before the eyes of European statesmen, must our Imperial Union appear. These are the conditions the Empire presents at the time it is being moved to press upon France the demands of Newfoundland, for the revision of the Treaties of Paris and Utrecht, and the rescission of the Treaty of Versailles!

Great unions cannot be effected without some mutual sacrifices. But is not the occasion well worthy of sacrifices? Has not the time arrived when it has become a duty to strengthen the hands of the Empire? We stand at a critical juncture: at a crisis (I think it may be said without exaggeration) not only in the history of the Empire, but in the fate of civilization. These young nations may be serving that great cause by intervening at this moment to confirm the prestige of our Empire.

Shall we wait through more idle and hesitating years, till suddenly a disastrous juncture arises for the Mother Country—till a calamitous war, perhaps, has overwhelmed her prosperity and is putting her existence at stake? Then shall the Colonies fling their young fortunes into the gulf of her ruin? That would be romantic!

Or shall we evade such risks: not declaring ourselves until some golden moment when the sun of England shines clear and securely at a zenith of power and prosperity? May we hold ourselves ready either to desert or confirm our alliance, as circumstances may invite? This would be the opposite extreme. If one course might be Quixotic, would not the other policy be grovelling? Canadians, I believe, would blush to think of their country deliberately preparing to become a *Vicar of Bray* among nations.

The middle course is more consistent alike with honour and with reason. Let us make our election now. Let us at once assume our place beside the Mother Country, at a time when the future is not free from uncertainties nor wholly unclouded with perils; but when our very decision must help, in some measure, towards a right solution, and may lead to a happy issue from all those possibilities that menace interests more general than our own. Is not this the action which wisdom would advise and which our honour and our duty to humanity seem to command?

Our choice of the right may not fail even of material rewards. The life blood of population, capital and enterprise, which has turned aside from the narrow and shifting courses of colonial existence, may gladly pour into the straightened channel opened within an assured Imperial Union.

England, tired of scattering her annual millions over dishonest states and half-civilized republics, will yet find vast openings (for certainly not more precarious investments) in the almost untouched development of Canada, Australia and British Africa. At the present time, a large proportion of England's foreign investments are unprofitable. Were the worst to happen—were an equal proportion of loss to result from colonial investments—would it be no consolation to know that every sovereign not immediately returned with usury may indirectly have helped in establishing some son of England in a more prosperous home without deserting his native flag, or adding to the force of nations whose policies are hostile to the prosperity of the Motherland, and to the cultivation of benevolence between nations?

If in 1792 the New Empire, securely launched upon the duties of another age, is able to celebrate the crisis of its history successfully passed, I believe that the sister Republic will not stand jealously aloof. It will rather join in the rejoicings of its kindred union over the con-

summation of the work of a century. It will recognize the final ripening of greater destinies, that Time has had still longer in preparation.

May not an impulse be communicated to the whole current of English life? Europe may witness the revival of the spirit of Elizabethan England, that has not been dead but sleeping. The united people of the New Empire may spring like a young lion from its slumbers, shaking off the follies of idleness, the vermin-brood of scandals and infamies that have preyed upon its immobility. May an enlightened enthusiasm of patriotism become an inspiration to conduct. May insincere ambitions of politics, defilements of literature, debasements of the stage, all be expelled, like diseases by the reviving vigour of the blood!

## PARIS LETTER.

AFTER sixty years of occupation the French do not emigrate to Algeria. After sixty years of conquest there are only 215,000 Frenchmen in Algeria, and as many foreigners. Why is this? An authority in the *Temps* explains that the intending emigrant, besides a free grant of land, expects the Government to stock, work it, and feed him for some years. The successful emigrant in Algeria is he who has purchased the concession of a free-holder and depends on himself. When he has put a portion of his capital in the fee simple of the land, he has an interest to develop his property. No means are taken to make known Algeria to the French, as in the case of English emigration societies. No publicity exists; no “Tracts for the Times” distributed; no “Word in Season” uttered. Algeria has Deputies and Senators in the home Legislature, elected by the French inhabitants and officials, not by the native population; and that is claimed to be colonial representation! The hatred of the natives against their conquerors, and the dread of a rising, make Frenchmen prefer the safe asphaltum of the Boulevards.

One of the most natural curiosities of the 1889 Exhibition was the Senegambian king, Dinah-Salifou. He had his highest seat in all the Synagogues, and he called the Shah of Persia his “cousin.” He was got up regardless of expense. A rich, gold, embroidered alb, once the property of a Spanish prelate, but with the arms of the cross picked out, was purchased and given to the nigger king; his walking-stick was a gilt-headed Bumble staff; he wore patent leather shoes, scarlet stockings, a cow-boy's hat with a cataract of multicoloured ribbons, and had an *en tout cas* in the form of a tent-umbrella. He out-interested the Eiffel Tower when he promenaded in the grounds. This was the intelligent foreigner who dropped into our age of telephones, eight hours a day work, profit sharing, and universal suffrage.

On his return to his kingdom he appeared in his Paris costume to his subjects. They instantly bolted at his “apparition,” beat drums, and set the praying machines at extra speed to exorcise the “Evil Spirit.” Dinah killed his brother, being unable to brook a rival near his throne. He was ambitious to build a palace like that of Versailles; next he wanted to conquer like Napoleon I. This was too much for the French, so a few weeks ago he was invited to visit the Governor General of Senegal. On arriving at St. Louis, Dinah was placed in a barrack and told that it and the grounds were to be his residence for life, as if an Ab-el-Kader or a Burman king. Such is the hero and the victim of the Exhibition of 1889. He ought to study French to be able to read Bossuet on the nothingness of royal grandeur.

People are surprised that Prince Napoleon has only remembered his son Louis in his will. However, the total amount of his property, under three million francs, is not worth squabbling over. But the omission of his wife's name in the will is considered odd; he always treated the Princess Clothilde kindly, while estimating her no higher than a baby; he never interfered with her piety, and familiarly alluded to her as “the family praying machine.” The public takes no interest in the “young Napoleon.” He made great efforts to dodge a reconciliation with his father; he sat in the drawing-room adjoining the sick chamber, and when a visitor's foot was heard, he rose, pretending to be leaving his father's sick room, or going to enter it. And all this comedy was visible to the permanent crowd stationed before the hotel windows. To be equitable, the public is equally indifferent to the Duc d'Orléans, whether he be in Paris acting as a light porter to a star songstress or studying the petroleum Geysers at Baku. The French are soured, if agriculturists, at the weather, and disheartened, if traders, at the paralysis of business. In presence of the coming ultra tariff, foreign shop-keepers and the representatives of foreign firms are preparing to depart by giving landlords notice to quit for business premises and residences. The latter, if in the suburbs, will be difficult to get rid of, being either held on lease or as the property of the occupier.

The new humane law on Conditional Punishment has just come into operation. When an accused is condemned for theft, etc., the sentence will not be executed if during five years there be no relapse into crime; nor will the condemnation figure in the police biography of the convicted, an important concession for those truly desirous of rising again to the social surface. In case of relapse the first sentence becomes operative, and will be doubled for the new misdemeanour. On being liberated the gaol-bird must reside during ten years in a district fixed by the authorities. That ought to lessen recruits for the army—60,000 strong of recidivists. Senator Béranger is the author of