

them when they are against you. Those who are reasonable will do this, and for the rest—I will wait until they grow older and wiser; meantime, I shall say what I think is right and just.

ALFRED J. BRAY.

WHAT IS A NATIONAL POLICY?

Of late years Canadians have been made familiar with the cry of Nationalism,—the demand for a National Policy in opposition to the interests of a party. Whether the Canadian Confederacy may claim, or may even hope, to be recognised as a nationality, has been questioned. We have been reminded, in reference to the day which ushered in the young Confederacy eleven years ago, that "the mere explosion of tons of gunpowder in pyrotechnic displays, and salvos of artillery, and *feux de joie*, does not constitute the baptism of fire by which a people announces that it has been born into the family of the nations." We have been told that the force of repulsion among the heterogeneous elements of our population is stronger than any force of cohesion, and that therefore there is little likelihood of these elements ever being welded into one nation.

If there is any ground for protesting against such a gloomy forecast of our future, it is surely to be discovered in that cry of Nationalism which has recently made itself heard above the din of our party strifes. It would be premature, indeed, to found much upon the popular cry, so inarticulate as this must be acknowledged still to be; for its influence in fusing the elements of our population into the unity of a national existence must depend on the direction it takes. But it may surely with fairness be taken as evidence of an aspiration after national unity existing and operating in the minds of many Canadians. Whether this aspiration will assume predominance among the political tendencies of our people, it would be hazardous to predict; but it is a significant fact, in view both of its future influence and its future direction, that it has manifested itself, not in the passionate shouts of an unreasoning mob, but in the quiet, thoughtful, and often earnest, utterances of the more intelligent, especially among the younger men of Canada. Let those who would lead the dominant party of the future take note of this fact!

It has just been pointed out that this demand for a National Policy is still a somewhat inarticulate cry, and that its value will depend upon the direction which it may take. It is incumbent, therefore, upon those who sympathise with this demand, or recognise the valuable service it may render in purifying our political life, to direct it, if possible, into such a channel as will most certainly lead to the end at which it aims. It is with a view to this that the question is proposed, which heads this article,—What is a National Policy? It may be assumed that those who desire an answer to this question, though unconnected with any political party, do not intend to make of themselves political hermits, but are anxious to use their political influence, and to use it justly, even though it should amount to no more than the recording of a vote. This necessity of political action, while one is eager to enjoy an atmosphere free from the poison of party spirit, often entails a conflict of considerations, amid which the line of duty becomes hard to trace. The very crisis, at which we now stand on the eve of a general election, imposes upon the adherents of a National, as opposed to a Party Policy, this difficulty of determining the course which a National Policy demands. For unfortunately the problem necessarily takes the form of a party question. We are not merely called to discover, by a dispassionate philosophical investigation, the abstract policy which is most conducive to the national interests; we are required to determine, whether the national interests can be more effectively secured by voting for the Government or for the Opposition. It is true, there is a question, which has been raised into some prominence in the controversy between the two parties, and which cannot be said to be a mere party question. This is the question which usually goes by the name of Protection. But for many reasons it is desirable that this aspect of the controversy between the two parties should be reserved for consideration in a separate article. The rival claims of the two parties upon the adherents of a National Policy may, with advantage, be first parties upon the adherents of a National Policy may, with advantage, be first of all considered apart from the question of Protection. The party on the Opposition benches claim that, as a party, they are more worthy of controlling the policy and the treasury of the nation than the party who form the Government. Are we to recognise their claim? And if so, for what reason?

The party who make such a claim, accept the *onus probandi*, impose on themselves the obligation of proving their right to supplant the occupants of the Treasury benches. On the other hand, the people of Canada have a right to require that the reasons for supplementing the present Government are of sufficient weight to justify such a violent disturbance of our political life. Now, apart from the subject of Protection which has been reserved for future discussion, what are the sum and substance of the reasons urged for expelling the present Ministry from office? These reasons may be generally described as consisting in a criticism of the conduct of the Government. It is urged that the administration of public affairs in general, or that some particular act or acts of the administration, have been such as to make ministers forfeit the further confidence of the country. The charge against the Ministry is here put in two aspects; for the criticism of their conduct sometimes fastens on particular acts, but, perhaps, more commonly, expatiates at large over their management of public affairs. As long as the criticism assumes only the latter form, it is too vague to admit of any satisfactory discussion. It is but fair, however, to point out that a general review of the public business since the present Ministry came into office does not exhibit to the unprejudiced mind any evidence of such flagrant maladministration as to require the extreme measure which the Opposition demand. Is there any more satisfaction to be obtained from a detailed examination into the public acts of the Ministry? Can any particular act or acts be signalised, which call for an outbreak of public indignation against the Government, and an unequivocal condemnation of them at the polls? If the Opposition can adduce any evidence of this sort, on which to base a verdict against the Ministry, they have certainly hitherto failed to do so in a decided way. Among all the shortcomings of the Government, which have been paraded on the left side of the House and reiterated to weariness by the

Opposition press, not an action has been obtruded into view, over which it was possible to work up any indignant passion, except among the speakers and writers, whose party connections necessitate that kind of performance. In this respect there is a prominent contrast between the position of affairs in which the present Government are placed, and that in which their predecessors were driven from office. That memorable crisis in our political history is too recent to require that it should be related here. It is sufficient to remember that, at that period, a great crime against the national honour, which blazoned our political corruption before the world, formed the ground of a verdict in which the people of Canada simply confirmed the unanimous condemnation which had been passed upon their rulers in the dispassionate political criticism of other countries. Until the Opposition can charge upon the Government some misdemeanour which would justify a similar expression of popular indignation, the elector, to whom it is the interests of a nation and not of a party that are at stake, must refuse to vote for the expulsion of the present ministers from office.

In all this it is by no means to be understood that the conduct of the Government has been faultless. On the contrary, were this the proper place, numerous objections might be brought against the course pursued by the Government on several occasions; and I believe I am not mistaken in asserting that none would more frankly admit the imperfections of his administration than the First Minister of the Crown himself. But, setting aside the worthless assertions of that unscrupulous mendacity which is generated in our party strifes, let us admit every just complaint that even the severest criticism has brought home to the Government: have the Opposition thereby made out their case? We know well enough, even without the vehement talking and writing of our Opposition friends, that the administration of affairs for the past five years has been far from perfect in Canada, or, for that matter, in any other country under the sun; but that is not what we want to know. We want to know what ground there is for believing that the management of public business would be stained with less corruption and incompetence in the hands of the Opposition than in those of the present Ministry; and with the memory of the shame which they brought upon our country five years ago, it does seem like an insult to our intelligence when we are asked to hand over the national treasury to the Opposition in the hope of a more honourable administration of the trust than is at present secured.

It appears, then, from the above considerations that the elector who desires to promote a truly national policy has no interest in supplanting the party in power merely to make way for another party, who not only give no proof of superior purity or superior competence, but were proved to have brought the country into dishonour before the world, when last they held the reins of power. But in all these considerations an important question has been waived. It is urged that the refusal of the Government to protect the manufacturing interests of the country constitutes a political delinquency sufficiently grave to require that the confidence of the people should be withdrawn from them at the coming elections. Have the Government thereby shown themselves incompetent or unwilling to advance a truly national policy? This is the question reserved for discussion in another article.

J. CLARK MURRAY.

SOME FACTS FROM WITHIN.

Any student of history who has watched the changes going on in the Roman Catholic Church within the last twenty years, must be convinced that side by side with a watchful resistance, the policy of neutrality is often the wisest. I am frequently reminded of the dilemma into which a peacemaker may get who undertakes to interfere between a quarrelling man and wife, when I observe how often the stupid zeal of narrow-minded observers puts a stumbling-block in the way of Protestant progress. Many a zealot has brought disaster upon a good cause. There are zealots and zealots. But the worst of evils is your blind zealot, who is ready to knock his own head, or his neighbour's, against a wall, in fulsome hope that a breach may be made. The consequence is generally that the breach is made in the man's head instead of in the wall.

I wish to point out by a few facts from history past and present, how such a policy as that favoured by the Orange advisers in this Province may be a very unwise and foolish display of mistaken zeal.

Is it not a fact that the Church of Rome in all ages has tyrannized over its own people, and that in its bosom, from among the children it has nursed, the great movements against it have always been born? It is a harsh friend to us, but it is also a cruel mother to its own; and God has not made the human mind and heart for man to mould into slavish obedience to the fearful oppression of any hierarchy in the world. Let us briefly look at a few facts.

In Germany, in the 16th century, it was a Roman Catholic priest who began the work of the Reformation, and Roman Catholic priests who were martyred for resisting the arrogance of their Church. When in this century the Pope ordered his bishops to disobey the civil law, and presumed to nullify laws made for the protection of the State, it was Roman Catholics under Dollinger who protested, and resisted the Ultramontane crusade against the unity of the German Empire and the supremacy of its Protestant King. In France it was a Roman Catholic (Abbé Michaud) Vicar of the Madeleine, a well known divine, who openly opposed infallibility. Large numbers of Roman Catholic priests and laymen refused to allow the Pope to supplant Christ by the Syllabus, and education has been taken out of the hands of the clergy. We hear much of infidelity among the French. A couple of years ago I travelled through France, and met many educated Frenchmen who spoke with the greatest contempt of the ignorance of their hierarchy, and blamed them for any infidelity existing. In Portugal it was Roman Catholics who boldly resisted the modern aggressions of their priests. In Mexico it is Roman Catholics who have fought against Papal intolerance. In Brazil the Council of State has decided that Papal bulls cannot take effect without receiving the Government permission, and that excommunication has no effect in civil relations. In Guatemala, where the Romish was the only and established Church, the craft and greed of the Jesuits overstepped itself, and Government has decreed religious liberty in that Republic, and declared that "the Roman Catholic Church is purer in