

years of our connection with her, has never done us one act of injustice or tyranny? Is it a noble sentiment to demand that Canada should strike the first blow at that grand confederation—whose greatness she shares—and which is at once the wonder and the pride of the civilized world? A fig for such sentiment!

We are already free—free to think, free to vote, free to speak, free to act. And all this freedom we owe, under God, to the example and assistance of Britain, and to the efforts of men who would have died a hundred times rather than serve the cause that you are serving or fight the battle which you are fighting. I feel very strongly on this subject, Mr. Editor, and as I close this somewhat lengthy letter, I do so with an earnest prayer to the Lord and Ruler of nations—in whose hand the future destiny of our beloved country lies—that it will please Him to frustrate the efforts of all those who, like THE WEEK, are endeavouring to undo the work which so many gallant arms and noble minds have laboured to consummate.

TRUE CANADIAN.

CANADIAN LOYALTY.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—An article in a recent issue of THE WEEK by C. P. McLennan, of Halifax, calls strongly in question the loyalty of Canadians generally to their "country, institutions and ideas" as compared with people of the United States. The National idea in Canada, it seems, has race and religious differences to contend with in one part, a spirit of provincial isolation and prejudice in another, and the straggling and disbanded nature of its settlement throughout. The condition of the country is painted as one of "national apathy and threatened disintegration." The reason of this alleged lack of loyalty in Canada as compared with the United States is asserted to be "due to a great extent to the independent status of the one and the dependent status of the other." It must be evident that if the Canadian people are lacking in loyalty—the spirit in which a people make common cause for the common welfare—to the extent represented by Mr. McLennan, they lack the first element necessary to make an independent existence possible, or at least successful. To give such a people independence would be to invite subjection or anarchy. A people must have a national spirit before they are fit to take place as a nation. To say that they lack such a spirit is to say that they are unfit to be a nation.

It appears to be quite the fashion with a number of writers, who affect the coolly unprejudiced, the closely reasoned, the calmly judicial tone, to hold on various grounds that Canada's present is clouded, and its future dark, and that neither the country nor people rank sufficiently high as compared with others to assure a national existence. The view which any person gets of any existing thing depends very much on the standpoint from which he chooses to take it. No doubt an unfavourable and still logically correct view of Canada's condition and prospects can be taken by those who choose to take the view in certain lights or from certain points. If the thing criticized is a failure merely because it does not reach each standard set up for it by its several critics, it is very easy to prove that Canada is a failure. It is quite customary to compare Canada with Great Britain or the United States to its disadvantage. Certainly Canada is very far behind the former in, say, wealth, military prestige and literary achievement, and behind the latter in population, wealth, and many other things of greater or less importance. But those who are inclined to make these unfavourable comparisons should remember that inasmuch as Canada is neither Great Britain nor the United States it is different in many ways from both, and that in these very differences may lie much of its attractiveness to its present population. Although it may be far behind one or the other in this or that particular it may also be as far in advance of either or both in others. While Great Britain and the United States excel Canada in achievement, it is a simple matter of fact that Canada excels either in remaining opportunities and possibilities. Therefore, while Great Britain and the United States are perhaps better countries to talk or read of, Canada is a better country to live in and for than they. Properly, the question is not, Does Canada equal Great Britain or the United States in certain particulars? but, Has it those elements that tend to human welfare in as great a degree as they, so that in due time it may reach a proportionate development? One of these elements is certainly loyalty—the spirit which impels the citizen to do, to dare, and to suffer for the present and future welfare of his country. That Canadians in their present position are quite equal to their neighbours in this particular quality is fortunately easy of proof.

The sweeping charge of lack of loyalty made by Mr. McLennan against the people of Canada as compared with those of the United States is based on the alleged more universal and enthusiastic celebration of July 4th south of the line than of July 1st north of it, which latter celebration, Mr. McLennan says, is mainly confined to Ontario. This is surely a slight foundation upon which to rest such a weighty conclusion, especially if the enthusiasm manifested by the people of the United States is taken at the value placed upon it by Mr. McLennan when he says: "The latter's patriotism too often degenerates into nauseating conceit, and Fourth of July orations, when deprived of froth and fustian, not unfrequently leave nothing but a residue of abominable bumptiousness."

Also, "This is possibly due in great measure to the ignorance of the average American of the resources and capabilities of lands other than his own." Merely because Canadians do not show that national ignorance, that nauseating conceit, that abominable bumptiousness, it is surely unfair to accuse them of national apathy or to assert that their country is threatened with disintegration. The observance of the First of July is not confined to Ontario. It is observed as universally if not as noisily throughout Manitoba, the North West and, perhaps, British Columbia as the Fourth is in the United States. If the city of Montreal were to remain the centre of gravity, as it probably will the commercial capital, of the country for all time, and if the First of July is not celebrated in Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, and if the importance attached by Mr. McLennan to that alleged fact may fairly be so attached, the national outlook is not as promising as would meet the hopes of some, although far from as hopeless as others seem to believe. But when it is remembered that the centre of gravity is each year moving westward, to rest ultimately at Winnipeg or some point further west; that, notwithstanding the magnificent distances between, from Montreal to the Pacific Ocean the overwhelming majority of the people are one in race, in religion, in fellow-feeling and in national aspirations, it must be evident that, admitting the worst view of the present case—the possible secession of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces—time is overwhelmingly on the side of a numerous, a powerful, a great Canadian nation.

Admitting—for argument's sake only—that there is a lack of sympathy between Ontario and Quebec on account of race and religious differences, and between both and the Maritime Provinces on account of the feeling of extreme provincial loyalty still ruling in the latter, there are bonds of interest on both sides sufficiently strong to ensure the continuance of the connection between the eastern and the western provinces, unless that connection is subjected to a strain more severe than any yet dreamed of. An outlet to the Atlantic in winter and summer is a commercial necessity to Western Canada and it is very advantageous, if not absolutely necessary, to have such an outlet under some control. On the other hand, the ports of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces stand no chance of being made leading ports of the United States, even if these provinces were annexed to that country, while if separated from Western Canada they would not enjoy any advantage regarding its traffic over those of the United States, which would be their present loss, and the absolute ruin of their prospects of greatness in the future. The people of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces have everything to gain by the support and advancement of the Canadian union, and everything to lose by its disintegration; while the people of Ontario and the west have every confidence in themselves and their country to make it as good and as great as the greatest and best.

But better than any amount of abominable bumptiousness displayed in First of July orations, and better than any amount of speculation as to selfish and sectional interests, as proof of the loyalty of the Canadian people to the national idea is the record of the twenty-one years under confederation. At what period during the history of the United States or any other country was the national spirit displayed to a greater degree than it has been during these years by the four or five millions of Canadians in acquiring control of, governing and developing to a degree that vast area now known as Canada? in which acquirement, control and development the people of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces had and have equal part with those of Ontario. How many years had the United States existed as a sovereign nation, and how many millions of people and of wealth did it contain before it attempted such territorial acquisitions in furtherance of the national idea? How old was the country and how numerous and wealthy the people before the magnificent distances existing in that country, as in this, were annihilated in the first trans-continental railway? And how few the people of Canada and how lacking in wealth, comparatively, when that great work was paralleled and excelled by them? The one reason given for the C. P. R. was that it was a national necessity, and to that consideration, among all the peoples and interests from Cape Breton to Vancouver, all others had to give way. The high tariff policy—foreign to the instincts, and perhaps the interests, of the majority—was carried and is maintained on the national cry. It is strange that a people who have shown such enterprise in the cause and submitted to such sacrifices for the sake of national aggrandisement and progress should be accused of national apathy and their country thought to be threatened with disintegration.

But other proofs of Canadian loyalty than the mere outlay of money, the payment of taxes, the devising of schemes and the passing of bills are available. The grand test of loyalty is the willingness to risk, not property alone, but life itself for the cause of country. Loyalty which does not go to that depth is of little use, but loyalty that does is surely the true metal. Whenever the occasion has arisen for this supreme sacrifice the Canadians of the present day—as well as their fathers—have been ready to make it. The rally to meet the actual and threatened Fenian invasions from '68 to '70, and to quell the Red River and Saskatchewan rebellions, were surely hearty and ready enough to satisfy the most doubtful of the depth of loyalty of the people—a readiness and heartiness that was never equalled in the United States from the time of the declaration of independence to the present day, no matter how loudly the people may talk or how many

fire-crackers they may explode on each succeeding Fourth of July.

That Canada has to face difficulties which threaten the national existence is true—and so has every nation that ever was or ever will be, not excepting the United States. The fact that existing difficulties are discussed freely, generally, interestedly and intelligently, with a view to their solution, is no proof of threatened disintegration, but is rather an indication of healthy life and vigour. Inasmuch as perfection is unattained and unattainable in this world, the nation in which the question of national improvement is not a subject of interested debate is in a condition of stagnation tending to corruption and consequent disintegration. If it is true, as Mr. McLennan says, "that the United States is to the typical American the Alpha and Omega of the universe. Beyond its horizon he sees but faintly, and discerns nothing that removes from his mind the early inculcated idea that his country heads the list and that he himself is the most important citizen that dwells within it," so much the worse for the typical American, and by so much is he handicapped in the race with his Canadian relative, who is not so blinded by conceit as to prevent him from drawing from all sources the best of all the wisdom that the world from the stores of its countless ages affords. The mere fact that a difficulty exists is no proof that it will not be overcome or avoided. There is no reason to suppose that the difficulties now in view in Canada are greater than those which have been successfully overcome in the preceding years. There is every reason to believe that as those who have grown up since Confederation take part in public affairs to a greater degree each succeeding year, the consideration of these difficulties will be directed more and more in accordance with national ideas, to secure national unity and development, as in the nature of things they could not be while under the direction of men trained in the narrow school of provincial politics. The more able these men the more difficult for them to forget their early training and the more slowly must new ideas supplant theirs. Of whom it may truly be said, "they builded better than they knew."

That Canada's connection with Britain has tended against Canadian loyalty, Canadian unity, or Canadian progress in the past, or is likely to do so in the future, is an idea so far-fetched as to be ridiculous. As long as that connection is continued on as satisfactory a footing as in the past, on the grounds of the merest selfish interest, it would appear that loyalty to Britain and loyalty to Canada on the part of a resident of Canada were interchangeable terms. The four or five millions of Canadians would never have been able, would never have dared, would never have been permitted to rival their wealthy and powerful neighbours to the south as they have done, are doing, and will do to a still greater extent in the future, did they not enjoy the prestige of being a part of an empire more wealthy and more powerful than those neighbours. It is not conceivable that the fact of Canadians having always had a living part with Britain in all its manifold workings in every corner of the earth can have dwarfed their ideas, shrivelled their loyalty, or unfitted them in any way for the work of national development. Rather the effect must have been, and has been, to widen their ideas, add to their intelligence, intensify their loyalty, increase their confidence, and inform them of their responsibilities to a degree that has been impossible with the people of the United States, wrapped for over a hundred years in the mantle of their own conceited ignorance—if Mr. McLennan is to be believed.

With a country of most immense area, and a yet uncounted wealth of fields of forest and of mine, inhabited by a hardy, a vigorous, an industrious, an intelligent and a prolific people,—excelled by few if any of the nations of the earth in these particulars—possessed of a deep religious feeling, the belief in an absolute right and wrong—under which their social, judicial and political institutions are framed and administered; lacking nothing in energy, in enterprise, or in courage, that falls to the lot of the sons of men; there is everything in the past, the present and the future of Canada to develop to the highest and noblest degree that instinct of loyalty which is born with every man who is worthy of being free—from which birthright Canadians have not been debarred.

Edmonton, Aug. 21, 1889.

FRANK OLIVER.

MUSIC AND THE DRAMA.

MR. TORRINGTON, Mr. Edward Fisher, Miss Hillary, Mr. J. W. F. Harrison, and other well-known members of the local professions are returned to town. The Conservatory of Music issues in good time a very neat prospectus containing several new features. Mr. George Suckling also returns from Europe this week, where he has been making arrangements with Mme. Patey, Sarasate, D'Albert and others, for concerts and recitals in Canada.

MME. MODJESKA and her husband, Count Lozenta, have been visiting Mr. and Mrs. R. W. Gilder, at Marion, Mass.

THE engagement of Mdlle. Lilian Nordica by Mr. Abbey for his Italian opera season in America was made just before sailing. There is no doubt that it was a wise move on the part of the manager. It seems almost as if Patti, Albani and Nordica in one company would be an embarrassment of riches. Probably the truth of the matter is that Tamagno, who is one of the greatest tenors in the world, did not care to sing with Albani. This, indeed, was the report in London. Of course Patti and