

Kong as in London. That very clever radical journal the *Pall Mall Gazette* satisfies its patriotism and absolves the answer of the Colonial Secretary by slipshodly declaring that any conference held should be for the benefit of the Colonies themselves, that "It need have nothing to do with the Imperial Government," and having found out a common bond of agreement the conference might come to an end. Now, this is all very well to stave off a difficulty which must be fairly and frankly met, either by the present radical Government of England or by their successors—the Colonies would prefer the latter.

Taking Canada as an instance, the statesmen of this country, and it prides itself on having men of that stamp, know that a consolidation of the British Colonies in North America meant a higher political life either by a closer connection with Great Britain or as an independent power. The first, as a certainty, the second to be faced in the last extremity contemplated by the Gladstone and Bright party, and the reasons are evident. The Dominion is coterminous with the United States for the whole length of its frontier from east to west; that power which the imbecility of an English Cabinet and the treason of English demagogues created with a manifest destiny of aggression exerts already more than her due share of influence in the Imperial Councils and policy. Does Lord Grenville and his colleagues never consider that Canadian statesmen knowing far better than they can possibly do the aims and objects of the Washington politicians, would be far better qualified to give council on measures directly affecting the interests of the Dominion and Great Britain and indirectly affecting the other Colonies, than the Imperial Cabinet with all its diplomatic skill and wisdom, or while surrendering Ireland to the Fenians, will they deny the British Colonists a share in the councils of the Empire to which it is their glory to belong?

It is quite true that free representative institutions sufficient to manage all their local affairs have been conceded to the Colonies, and they are practically independent in everything but the name. But, what then? Is it necessary in seeking closer relations with Great Britain that any portion of that independence should be abandoned? It would be silly to suppose so, and yet it is what the Liberal Press of England demands as a necessary preliminary to any closer connection.

It is evident enough that the whole question is not understood by those people, while the Colonists have looked on it as a necessary consequence of their prosperity, the *Pall Mall Gazette* narrows the whole down to the issues "That New Zealand wishes for a British regiment on the Red River to have nothing to do with Canada," quietly ignoring the fact that those are by no means the wishes or wants of five millions of British subjects in the Colonies named.

While perfectly competent to take care of their own local affairs they want a closer union with Great Britain for purposes of common safety and defence, as well as greater uniformity in commercial and fiscal relations, issues totally apart from those assumed by the Gladstone Bright partisans.

In Canada the example of the consolidation of the powers of the United States by the forcible suppression of States' rights has directed the minds of the people to that closer affiliation with the parent State, which the circumstances of the case requires. While the action of the Washington Government and its anxiety to gain a footing in the Antilles makes it desirable that this union should be extended to all the outlying British Colonies.

Whatever form this union may take, or whatever influence or status the Colonies may be conceded in the Councils of the Empire are problems to be worked out by statesmen of a very different stamp to the Right Hon. Peer at the head of the Colonial office or his colleagues. That there is urgent necessity for a closer union is indisputable; that it can be effected without destroying the autonomy of the Colonies or interfering with that of Great Britain, and that the Colonies have demands, not on her resources but on her power, which they have helped to build up, is beyond question; and the results of those demands would not be a tax on her wealth but a further consolidation of her power and extension of her influence. The day for trifling with those efforts and aspirations is past. A *laissez faire* pointing towards the Conference at Albany in 1755 laid the foundation for the success of the rebellion of 1775. Will the Radicals repeat the experiment?

In another column will be found an article from the *New York Times* detailing the steps taken for the annexation of the territories of the Republic of San Domingo, in which the existence of the Haytian Republic is studiously ignored. The island of Hayti or San Domingo has an area of 29,000 square miles, of this 11,000 square miles belong to the Haytian Republic, chiefly negroes, while 12,000 square miles are peopled by 150,000 Spaniards, who have been long organized as a republic, and it is with Baez, the President, and his officers that the United States authorities have succeeded, according to their own account, in driving this hard bargain.

The policy of ignoring the Negro Republic with its 700,000 souls is apparent enough. The claim the United States wish to found on the bargain and sale by Baez will be to the whole island, and the nigger element may look out for coercion. But there may be two sides to that view of the case. This very Haytian Republic checked the victorious career of a far greater soldier and statesman than General Grant.

In 1794 the French Directory declared the Negroes free, and in a little while after they rose and murdered the planters. The Direc-

tory thereupon attempted to restore the dominion of France, but, headed by the celebrated Toussaint L'Overture, they drove the troops of that country from the island. In 1802 the first Napoleon dispatched an immense armament to Hayti under his brother-in-law, LeClerc, and the Negroes, after a severe struggle, were forced to surrender. The melancholy episode of the fate of Toussaint L'Overture is well known; his conqueror's triumph was short lived. The war with the negroes was renewed with the utmost fury, and between disease and battle they were reduced from 30,000 to 10,000 men. The rupture of the peace of Amiens brought Great Britain on the scene, and the remains of the French army capitulated to a British armament in November, 1803. Altogether constant war has been the normal state of affairs, and doubtless there are good soldiers amongst the Negroes which will make the United States purchase a dear bargain. On the whole the negotiations, if allowed to be carried out without the interference of the European powers, will probably result in a deadly war with the Haytians and grave complications elsewhere.

HISTORICAL and political philosophers are in the habit of indulging the prevalent taste for theorising in depicting the blessings which have accrued to civilization and humanity by the successful treason which severed the North American Colonies from the British Empire, and the impulse given to the world by the dissemination of the principles of constitutional liberty and true freedom through the extended influence of the spreading Anglo-Saxon race. Enthusiasts like the author of "Greater Britain," blessed with a concentration of the united physical, mental, and moral attributes of the admirable Crichton, able to do the tour of the world in two short years and condense the experience acquired in a neat volume only remarkable for extreme dogmatism and a total absence of modesty, may pronounce on the full value to humanity of the event which gave to the world a new nation with original ideas of public morality, and something like Rob Roy's notion of international equity:

"Dear, honest souls, the good old rule,  
Sufficeth them the simple plan,  
That they might take who had the power,  
And they might keep who can."

This highly civilised, ultra moral thoroughly moderate and honest people, about whose admirable quality John Bull's political economists, radicals and theorists go into extacies, are busily engaged in the laudable work of increasing their naval armaments for the avowed purpose of making them equal to those of England and France, and vindicating their "national principles."

An article in the *Broad Arrow* of January 8th deals with this development of the policy of the United States as something new and startling, and as a subject for just astonishment, involving very perplexing considerations, especially as the United States