

fear.' It is generally realized that Germany and Prussia have outgrown absolutism, that even a genius like Frederick the Great would be compelled to desist from interfering directly with the administration of the laws. But what can be done to change our [German] governmental methods? It is not likely that the Kaiser is aware of the feeling against him. The fog that envelops all royal courts is too thick for that. If the Kaiser regards the *political* advisers of the crown as mistaken, they must resign. Perhaps others, more subservient, will be called to take their places in the cabinet. But these, too, must be taught their duty by public criticism. If public opinion would only make up its mind to give no quarter, no statesman worth his salt would be content henceforth to be the mere executor of personal rule."—*Translations made for THE LITERARY DIGEST.*

DOES RUSSIA WISH WAR?

REASONS for a negative answer to this question are given by the Montreal *Herald*, and these reasons are summed up in the statement that it is not to Russia's interest to provoke war. Says *The Herald*:

"It would be overstating the case to say that she [Russia] can not afford to go to war, but it is quite certain that the penalty



HAUNTED!

—Punch.

that she would pay for provoking war would be out of all proportion to any possible advantage she could gain from the most favorable issue of the struggle. The fact is sometimes forgotten that the Russian Government is a gigantic corporation doing business on a scale of unexampled magnitude. In the words of the Russian *Journal of Financial Statistics*, the Russian state is the greatest economic unit on the face of the globe. This authority concedes that, as a nation and a country, Russia is far behind England in wealth and America in productiveness. But this does not prevent the Russian state standing alone in the magnitude of its business operations. As a land-owner it draws, according to the journal, an annual net profit of over twenty-three millions of dollars from its forests, mines, and agricultural property, while the land it has ceded to or purchased for the communities of ex-serfs brings it in over forty-one millions. As a constructor and purchaser of railways, it is building one of the longest lines in the world and works 20,300 miles of railway on its own account, the net profit on which is reckoned at over \$68,000,000 a year. Besides being a capitalist and banker, the Russian state is a metallurgist and spirit merchant. Apart from its

banking operations, the state treasury received in 1898 over \$876,000,000 into its coffers, nearly \$39,000,000 of which was revenue other than that received from taxation."

Poor harvests have affected the Russian money market unfavorably, tho De Witte hopes for a favorable turn in financial affairs of the nation in the near future. But, however that may be, remarks *The Herald*, "it is sufficiently obvious that the stability of the economic and financial system of Russia is far from being secure under ordinary conditions, and is hardly calculated to stand the pressure of a great foreign war."

BRITISH REFUSAL TO RECEIVE THE BOER PEACE DELEGATES.

EUROPEAN comment on the South African war is now chiefly directed to the refusal of the British Government to permit Messrs. Merriman and Sauer to appear before the bar of the House of Commons. These Boer delegates desired to present a petition, in general representing the views of the Afrikaner Bond, with reference to the terms on which peace should be made; and requesting that, in any final settlement, the Dutch element be given equal governmental rights with the English, "lest the two white races suffer from permanent dissensions." The Government's rejection of the petition was, says *The Standard* (London), "what it should have been: an absolute refusal of an unjustifiable demand." The "most extraordinary generosity of the terms offered to a beaten foe," and rejected, has not, continues *The Standard*, impressed the enemy nor the Opposition in England. They must have another lesson. It says further: "All we can say is that we are quite sincere in our determination to give all South Africa the privilege of Responsible Government in due course of time. But of the fitting season we ourselves must be the arbiters. It will depend on circumstances—on the pacification of the country, on the character of the new population, and on the temper of the Dutch. Firm and just, but still autocratic, rule is all we are entitled to promise for the present." These delegates from a disloyal organization, says *The Times* (London), asked leave to usurp the position of arbitrators—"a position which sovereign states have shrunk from attempting to assume"—and very properly they were not heard. This petition was the substance of the Boer demands before the war, says *The Morning Post* (London), and it will attract the sympathy of those only who, from the beginning, have been "opposed to the policy of this country and in favor of that of its enemies." The delegates, continues *The Post*, have one good quality:

"They are not lacking in effrontery, for their political careers have been spent in the effort to make British Government impossible in South Africa; their crowning success would have been the victory of the Boers in the present war; yet they have come to this country to try to deprive Great Britain of the fruits of her victory and to render as difficult as possible the future peace of South Africa. In their efforts for this end they rely on the help of that group of British politicians which in every international crisis of our time has found right and justice on the enemy's side. Messrs. Merriman and Sauer have their uses, of which just now the most valuable is that their presence may help British voters to distinguish between two different classes of politicians at home."

The Liberal and the other Opposition journals hold that the refusal to hear the delegates was a grave tactical blunder on the part of the Government. The Government's decision, says *The Speaker* (London), is more than discourtesy to the colonies represented; "it is supreme political folly." The Dutch colonists have had little reason, it thinks, to retain any confidence in British justice as exhibited in the colony. Was it wise policy to shatter their lingering confidence in British justice at home?

The delegates had a perfect right says *The Daily News* (London), which thoughtful, liberty-loving Englishmen everywhere will admit, to lay the Dutch view fully before the one tribunal which is supreme throughout the British empire, the high court of Parliament. It is not Mr. Merriman and Mr. Sauer who are in question; it is the unity and integrity of the empire. The matter concerns the terms of peace; but the body to which these gentlemen would have applied if it had jurisdiction, namely, the Legislative Assembly at the Cape, can not receive such a petition. The British House of Commons is the proper, and the only proper body to address. If the Government had been astute, it would have remembered the precedents for granting such requests. Against the Quebec bill of 1791, which established the constitution of Canada, two petitions were presented, and in both instances the petitioners were heard. The case of Mr. Roebuck is more recent. He lost his seat in the House of Commons at the general election of 1837; but in 1838 he addressed the House below the bar against Lord John Russell's bill to suspend the constitution of Lower Canada. Against suspending the constitution of Jamaica in 1839, as the constitution of Cape Colony has been suspended now, Mr. Burge spoke for the House of Assembly, and Sergeant Merewether for the people of Jamaica.

There is one precedent, however, upon which *The News* hopes the Government will not lay too much stress. This occurred just before the American war of independence:

"On the 14th of March, 1774, a petition was read to the House of Commons from William Bollen, agent for the council of Massachusetts. But the House rejected it with contempt. Benjamin Franklin was heard in the same cause, not before the House of Commons, but before the Privy Council. He was attacked with extreme virulence by the solicitor-general, Sir Alexander Wedderburn, afterward Lord Loughborough, of whom Junius said that there was something about him which even treachery would not trust. The privy councilors present, except Lord North, roared with laughter. Franklin wore a suit of spotted velvet. He was a careful man, and he kept that suit. But he did not wear it again until he signed, in 1778, the treaty with France which recognized the independence of the United States."

The imperialism of a Chamberlain, says the *Temps* (Paris), arguing in the same vein as the British Liberal journals, has changed the wise policy of the empire:

"It would be dangerous, unworthy of the British metropolis, according to this imperialism, to hear the views of the race which is in the majority in South Africa. Messrs. Merriman and Sauer, but yesterday ministers of the crown in the Schreiner cabinet, are looked upon with suspicion, almost as enemies. The South African League, the instrument of Anglo-Saxon insolence, has launched the bolt of excommunication against the great majority of the colonists of the Cape. [The *Temps* here refers to the fact that the South African League sent a demand to Parliament that the Boer delegates be not heard.] The ministry has bowed to this body, and has refused a hearing to the representatives of an entire race. . . . But the imperialistic counselors of Edward VII. should remember Benjamin Franklin and the Nemesis of History."—*Translations made for THE LITERARY DIGEST.*

EUROPEAN OPINION OF THE CAPTURE OF AGUINALDO.

EUROPEAN comment on the capture of Aguinaldo is brief, and, almost without exception, is to the effect that General Funston's method violated the spirit, if not the letter, even of the rule that everything is fair in war. Some things are not fair even in war, says the *Fremdenblatt* (Vienna), and one of these is forgery. Funston's act was contemptible. Quite American and therefore hypocritical, is the verdict of the *St. Petersburger Zeitung*. Treachery, contemptible treachery, says the *Época* (Madrid). Essentially dishonorable, declares the *Petite République* (Paris). A perpetual shame to the American republic, comments the *Lanterne* (Paris). The white man has had to bend very low in order to get the burden on his shoulders, says *The Guardian* (Manchester), which continues:

"There have been more wicked wars than this on the liberties

of the Filipinos, but never a more shabby war. It is nearly three years since the Americans, having gone to war with Spain for the liberties of Cuba, decided that it was their manifest destiny to deprive the Filipinos of their liberties. This was called taking up the white man's burden. For some time the Americans quite honestly believed that they were doing rather a noble, self-denying thing; but the cant phrases of three years ago are worn threadbare. Had Aguinaldo been captured in some spirited action in the field, American interest in the war might have revived. As it is, it was effected by a piece of sharp practise thoroughly in keeping with the rest of the war. Of all that curious mixture of sentiments, noble and ignoble, out of which the war with the Filipinos sprang, only the element of hypocrisy seems to have retained its original vigor."

As meaning the end of the war, the news of the capture is welcome, says *The Saturday Review* (London); but for Aguinaldo himself, "whose capture was effected by a gross act of treachery," there must be general sympathy. It adds:

"He gave the Americans invaluable assistance in the capture of Manila and in the previous maneuvers. He proved a faithful ally until, partly owing to a change of policy at Washington, partly to want of tact in American generals, war suddenly broke out between the allies on February 2, 1899. It is inevitable to compare the tactics successfully employed by Aguinaldo to those of De Wet. De Wet is probably the finer general, Aguinaldo the finer character. His proclamations were model expressions of statesmanlike and broad-minded policy, and considering his antecedents he proved himself singularly humane. He possessed, moreover, a genius for inspiring the scattered tribes with his own enthusiasm for the freedom which was promised him."—*Translations made for THE LITERARY DIGEST.*

AMERICAN CAPITAL IN CANADA.

IN view of the bitter criticism of the United States and of things American which comes so frequently from the Canadian press, it should be noted that the part played by American enterprise and capital in the Dominion is generally recognized by the more thoughtful journals of Canada. *The Canadian Manufacturer* (Toronto) declares that Canada must more and more turn to her Southern neighbor for the capital she needs. Speaking of the resources of the Dominion in the way of wood for paper pulp, this journal says that the promoters in this industry are all looking to the United States for capital. It is the same in other industries, continues *The Manufacturer*:

"It was in the United States that most of the Dominion Iron & Steel Company's issue of \$15,000,000 was underwritten last year. It is in New York and Philadelphia that a million dollars is being obtained for the new steel-works at Collingwood, Ont. To the United States Mr. Clergue [president of the new Algoma Central Railroad] has hitherto looked for the vast sums required for his undertaking, tho he is now in England, presumably to sell the bonds of his road. If we are ever to get the power developed at Niagara Falls, it must be by the aid of American enterprise, if not actual American capital."

When you come to think of it, says *The Herald*, also of Montreal, Americans have had a good deal to do and to say in the development of our resources; and it proceeds to put the case as follows:

"Who bought the claims for mines of our prospectors in British Columbia? The Americans!

"Who sold them to the Canadians afterward, pocketing fat profits? The Americans!

"Who have developed our wood-pulp trade? The Americans!

"Who sold us the wonderful Stanley mine? The Americans!

"Who started the iron industry in Sydney, Cape Breton? The Americans!

"Who pocket the millions therefrom? The Americans!

"Who is the moving spirit at Sault Ste. Marie? An American!

"Who has obtained elevator privileges from our harbor commissioners? Americans!

"Who fails to build elevators, and thereby helps Buffalo? Americans!

"Who will gobble our meat export trade? The Americans!

"Who have bought all our petroleum wells? The Americans!

"Who was called to reorganize our Grand Trunk Railway? An American!

"What architects get the work for our largest and finest buildings? Americans!

"Who are quickest to appreciate and employ our smartest young men? Americans!"