

teered their services in support of the Northern cause. Their blood stained many Union battlefields, yet because Jake Thompson and a few Southern refugees were permitted to find asylum in Canada, Mr. Laurier denounces his countrymen for obeying the laws of humanity!

Absorption by Brother Jonathan is Mr. Laurier's panacea. He repudiates all attempts to secure closer political relations with Great Britain. "It would embroil them (the colonies) in all the wars which Great Britain, in her present stage of advancement, might have to wage in all parts of the world." He tells us that he has refused all overtures for a trade league with England and her possessions, but he is ready to "accept any project which would seek the unification of England and of all the countries which have sprung from England—in fact, of the whole Anglo-Saxon race."

The project of unifying the whole Anglo-Saxon race is certainly *magnifique*, but as Mr. Laurier has celebrated his fiftieth birthday, he evidently intends to transfer the glory of its actual achievement to some remote descendant of his own sept. *Sic transit gloria!*

ONTARIO.

## REORGANIZATION OF THE CABINET.

### SIXTH ARTICLE.

I HAD not intended to recur to this subject, for the present, at all events, but it might be considered discourteous did I not reply to Senator Boulton (WEEK, Nov. 27). Moreover, some of his readers might fancy he correctly described my views, and my friend himself might be pained to think I was in the gall of the vilest political bitterness and bound by the bonds of the worst party iniquity. As a fact he has never joined issue with me at all. He falls into a like fallacy to that of some even learned members of the party to which I belong in the House of Commons, who, when I advocate that certain moral claims which accrued under the second homestead law shall be respected, reply with great cogency that the policy of giving second homesteads was a bad policy. Granted I was myself the first to point this out, I pointed it out when the Act was passed. But the reply is as logical as would be that of the debtor of a wine merchant who, on being asked for his account, should deliver a lecture on total abstinence.

In the fourth article (WEEK, Nov. 6), I was dealing with rumours of defections from the Conservative party. I laid down the proposition that the position of a man who deserts his party on *personal* grounds is humiliating and unhappy. In order further to emphasize this I said that "even the position of a man who on patriotic grounds unites with a former political foe *proves unsatisfactory*." As if replying to this we are told "the personal success or non-success of individuals does not controvert the *opposite view*." The opposite view would clearly be that the position of such men *proves satisfactory*. But this is not the "opposite view." Mr. Boulton proceeds to illustrate and enforce, but rather that there may be occasions when the interest of the country and the dictates of patriotism point to coalitions. Against this I never said a word. I hold strongly that country should be above party. I say George Brown behaved patriotically in joining Macdonald to bring about Confederation; but I say his entering Macdonald's Cabinet did not prove "satisfactory" to him. Was the Canning Coalition satisfactory? Did it not perish like an untimely birth before it could gain that hold on public confidence which had been forfeited by the sudden reconciliation of ancient enemies?

Is it not clear that all Brown patriotically aimed at could have been gained by his supporting Macdonald without entering his Cabinet? He might have then given the Premier of the day all his influence without in the least impairing his own strength. Take again, Mr. Macdougall. What was to prevent him voting with Macdonald on Confederation and supporting him afterwards independently without entering his Cabinet? And the lion of Nova Scotia—Joseph Howe? The historian may tell us what were his feelings when, to use his own language, he "took the shilling under John A." From that moment Samson was shorn of his hair. He said he had brought his province to the verge of bloodshed; to join John A. seemed the only patriotic course. I commend him for taking it, but did it "prove satisfactory"?

Evidently still combatting the view that it is wrong to join the "other side" under any circumstances, which, of course I do not hold, he cites Mr. Goschen in Lord Salisbury's Cabinet as an instance of a man who felt bound to "coalesce" on broad national grounds; he might, perhaps, with much appearance of truth, have added that it was an instance of such a course proving "satisfactory." Yet, what happened the other day? The national successor to Mr. W. H. Smith as leader of the Conservative party, in the Commons, was a Chancellor of the Exchequer. But as a Liberal serving in the Tory Cabinet, as a stranger within the gate, he was not acceptable to a considerable number of Lord Salisbury's following.

Mr. Boulton attributes a "second position" to me, but what it exactly is I don't know. It is apparently that parties exist only to reward life-long supporters. But I hold no such view, and take no such position. When pointing out the way proselytes are treated by their new friends, I was clearly thinking of men who leave their party on *personal* grounds, and whose motives therefore would not be above the "spoils."

Mr. Boulton thinks the earliest opportunity should be

given to the country to pronounce on the reconstructed Government, "otherwise a blow would be struck at the principles of our Constitution, and a precedent established that might justify an appeal to the people prior to future enumerations, to suit the exigencies of the moment and thus deprive constituencies of the representation awarded them under the Constitution." There is no such doctrine in the Constitution. It is purely a question of fitness; and a dissolution is the very last thing that would seem to be necessary "in consequence of the census." For, unfortunately, the increase in population during the decade has been too small to justify a general election in order to meet the revolutionary features of a new redistribution of seats. If as in the case of the first Reform Bill, or in that of Mr. Disraeli's Bill, if sixty-seven large members are enfranchised, a dissolution should take place at the earliest possible moment, but to insist on such a view to-day in Canada would be the veriest pedantry of politics.

Later on Mr. Boulton advocates a dissolution on the ground that "a new Government is to be entrusted with the guardianship of the public interests." But no such doctrine is found in the British Constitution. Quite the contrary. So long as Mr. Abbott has the confidence of the House of Commons there is no constitutional necessity for his appealing to the people, who, if dissatisfied with his Cabinet, will soon make him feel this through their representatives.

When Mr. Addington succeeded Pitt in the spring of 1801, he did not appeal to the people; but finding his influence in the House of Commons declining he advised the King to dissolve in the summer of 1802. In 1804, Pitt became Prime Minister, but he did not appeal to the people, but was content with the House elected under Addington. When Canning succeeded Lord Liverpool and made a Coalition Ministry, he did not feel called on to appeal to the country, and it is clear that the Whig, Lord Grey, would have been ready to work with the Duke of Wellington's Parliament had he not suffered defeat. Lord Melbourne carried on the business of the country for six years with a Parliament elected under the auspices of Sir Robert Peel, Lord Russell and after him Lord Derby, and then Mr. Disraeli worked with a House of Commons elected under Lord Palmerston. As long as a Ministry has the confidence of the House of Commons it is all right and can give the country a stable Government. Until Mr. Abbott has reorganized his Ministry and declared his policy, the judgment of Grits as well as Tories should be held in suspense. He may so organize and state such a programme as to win the confidence of the whole country, or he may fail even to attach to himself the following of Sir John Macdonald, or he may satisfy the Conservative party and exasperate their opponents. At present the Conservative party is moving along the Macdonald lines. The new Government is in a sense still embryotic, and whether a dissolution would be desirable will depend not on the fact that a new Government has been formed, but on its character and conduct. Lord John Russell, in 1828, on the formation of the Duke of Wellington's Ministry would not make up his mind regarding it "until he saw it act." He added: "It is but fair to wait for the measures of a new Ministry before the House decides upon its character." It is a vulgar proverb that you never know how far a frog can jump until you see him jump. And you can only judge of the capacity of a Government or a statesman by seeing them in action.

Mr. Boulton says: "Mr. Davin liberally quotes ancient history to illustrate his ideas, and, if his theories upon this point should be considered sound, it would be in contradistinction to the thoughts of the past handed down to us for the guidance of the future by Macaulay in his 'Lays of Ancient Rome' when he writes:—

Then none were for the party  
And all were for the State.

And they would read:—

Then all were for the party  
And none were for the State,

a position it is safe to say it would not be wise to take." I doubt very much if I have quoted *ancient* history in these articles, but had I done so, provided it was *apropos*, where would be the harm? But surely he does call the 'Lays of Ancient Rome' either ancient history or ancient poetry, and he has evidently forgotten what Macaulay says in his preface to the "Lays" concerning the person into whose mouth he puts the words quoted: "The following ballad (Horatius) is supposed to have been made about a hundred and twenty years after the war which it celebrates, and just before the taking of Rome by the Gauls. The author seems to have been an honest citizen, proud of the military glory of his country, sick of the disputes of factions, and much given to pining after good old times which had never really existed."

A critic (Winnipeg Tribune), who seems for some reason very angry, complains that in these articles analogies have been instituted between the Canadian situation and dramatic epochs in British history. Why should not such analogies be pointed out and useful conclusions drawn from them? The writer seems to think Canada in any of her moods unworthy of comparison with Great Britain? But why? And is the present situation in Canada wanting in dramatic interest? Sir John Macdonald filled a far larger place in Canada than Perceval did in England; he was a far greater man; is there anything inappropriate in referring to the circumstances under which say Lord Liverpool succeeded Mr. Perceval, reorganized his Ministry and remained in power so many years? This is the kind of ancient history that was referred to. Is it aston-

ishing that those who love Canada and are anxious for her future independence and greatness should, in this perilous hour, be occupied with the question of the reorganization of her Government? Only the optimists of thoughtless sanguine dreams, or of indifference, think there is no grave problem for Canada to solve to-day, and in reorganizing his Cabinet, whether conscious of it or not, Mr. Abbott will take action bearing on this, either helping towards the solution or making that solution more difficult; nay, it is within the bounds of possibility—not, we hope, of probability—to make that solution extremely difficult. And yet the angry critic of the *Tribune* is impatient that anyone should attempt to contribute something to the important issues which are connected with the making of the new Government! The problem of Canada's future cannot be solved by such a Government as Sir John Macdonald gave the people of Canada within the last few years, with two or three of the great departments directly connected with her development, touching her very life, almost worse than vacant. More is needed than even efficient administration, deplorably as that is needed. The power of diffusing a sense of life, of identity, of a national consciousness throughout Canada, is needed. The cries of the "Old Flag" and the "Old Policy" are essentially *ad captandum vulgus*, and unless you can add "and the old man," their auricular charm is gone; and "the old man" sleeps his well-won sleep on the Kingston hillside, where he played as a boy. Mr. Abbott may do service which will entitle him to be gratefully remembered in Canadian history, but the limitations of nature make it impossible he should be the Joshua to lead the way into the promised land. The task is an arduous one, but all great things are arduous. Rarely appears the manner of man needed for the present hour. He should unite in himself contradictory qualities—the eager faith of the enthusiast with the cold judgment of the political philosopher—the knot may be untied or unravelled, or it may have to be cut in twain. If severed, it must be by the sword of a crusader in the cool hand of a nineteenth century statesman.

NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN.

### PARIS LETTER.

THE Queen of England lent Paris one of her weather days for the interment, with full marshalic honours, of her late ambassador, the Earl of Lytton. The French had the sole control of the sad but brilliant ceremony, and as ever in matters of organization and artistic effect, the arrangements were faultless. Four thousand foot soldiers, three squadrons of cavalry—one being lancers—and two batteries of artillery composed the military escort. On each side of the line of route, from the Faubourg St. Honoré to the Place de l'Europe—a distance of one mile and a-half—there was a silent and respectful crowd of half a million of people. The official burial of the ambassador of a first-class power is a spectacle that Parisians do not witness more than once in their lifetime. Then the gorgeous and showy costumes and uniforms of ambassadors and their several attachés produced an imposing impression. One felt that the funeral had brought the French and English nations closer together.

The religious ceremony was short, and solemnly impressive from its simplicity. The galleries of the English Church were set apart for ladies, and were fully occupied by the relatives of foreign representatives and French functionaries. Detachments of cavalry and infantry opened the procession; then followed a military band executing mortuary airs; but one missed the massive throb notes and the piercing shrillness of the "Dead March in Saul." The hearse was drawn by four led horses, all heavily draped with rich silver ornaments. The four corners of the hearse displayed laurel wreaths; no flowers, in accordance with the well-known wishes of the deceased. The coffin was in beautiful polished oak, with gilt handles, and appeared to be as small as a boy's. The two sons of the deceased, aged fifteen and thirteen, and Mr. Balfour, his son-in-law, represented the family. The latter was among the observed of all the observers, on account of his distinguished brother. Then followed the diplomatic and official worlds in gala uniforms, and next the representatives of literature, art, science and politics. Apart from duty, press men mustered largely, for Earl Lytton, like his father, Earl Beaconsfield, and even the Marquis of Salisbury, had printer's ink on his fingers and a dash of the Bohemian in his blood.

There were three points where the procession appeared to signal advantage: approaching the Madeleine and the St. Augustin Churches, and crossing the railway bridge at the Place de l'Europe. The vista down the Boulevard Malesherbes was superb. As the hearse passed over the wide railway bridge the massed troops presented arms; the flags, with a cravat of crape, dipped, and the equally craped drums and bugles executed a salute. The hearse drew up before the entrance to the traffic dépôt, when the diplomatists and officials ranged in line, awaited the march past of the troops. A band in the vicinity played, this time, martial airs. As each general advanced with his battalion, he saluted with his sword; civilians raised their hats and the military attachés returned the professional salute. The same ceremony was paid to the flags. The trumpeters of the cuirassiers and dragons had crape favours round their instruments. The cavalry now carry the carabine in a leather sheath on the right side, like a sword. Next came two batteries, twelve guns of artillery with a real thud and roll of war.