

much like that of those early Americans whose horror of a national debt kept their country in time of war without a navy. It is not denied that just at present the public debt of Canada is a matter for grave and watchful concern. And a few individuals, who do not look before and after, may be conscious of a new impulse toward the Washington treasury. But to be despairing, or even downcast, is to forget that the Canadian debt is largely an investment. If the Northwest has been our oppressor, it cannot fail to be our redeemer.

Even in the meanwhile, however, the cost of government in Canada, inclusive of interest on the debt, is considerably lower than in the United States. The comparison to be of any value, mustowing to the different distribution of powers and responsibilities in the two countries, be of the total cost of government for all purposes, general, and local. And it should be made for places under similar circumstances. Take two agricultural and fruit-growing counties with no large city population, like Tompkins County, New York, on Lake Cayuga, and Kings County, Nova Scotia, on the Basin of Minas. In products and resources, as in the prosperity of the people, Kings, I am convinced from personal observation, has greatly the advantage. Yet, after careful calculation, I find that the cost of government for all purposes whatever—federal, state or provincial, county, district—aggregates in Tompkins County \$12.86 per capita, and in Kings County \$9.45. For the Province of Nova Scotia as a whole, the figures, which are not available would be found lower than for one of its best counties. On the other hand, the total cost of government averages for New York State \$17.10 per capita; and for Massachusetts it is \$19.64, for California \$20.60, for New Hampshire \$18.77, and for Vermont \$11.25. It is true that the public debt, the last bonds of which fall due in 1907, is being anticipated by means of surplus revenues at a rate which, according to the last report of Secretary Fairchild, will effect its extinction before 1900. This would make a reduction in federal taxation possible after that date. But long before it comes there will have been an enormous addition to the pension list and a vast expenditure for internal improvements and coast defences, which will more than counterbalance the extinction of the national debt. Canada, meantime, with her public works nearly complete, can and must practice the close economy of the earlier days of the republic.

ATTITUDE OF THE PARTIES.

I have now described the territory, resources, financial condition, population, and political organization of the Dominion of Canada. The picture, though faithful, may be somewhat new to Americans, whose view of Canada might be summed up in the words: "We have a little sister, and she bath no breasts." It remains to inquire what political destiny the Canadians under the influence of the agencies and circumstances just described, are likely to achieve. The future I take it will resemble the past. Men cannot order a new system of government like a new suit of clothes. Nor have Anglo-Saxons the inclination. Canadians, therefore, will walk in the old paths, with only such deviations as circumstances may suggest. But the drift of Canadian policy since 1840, and especially since 1867, may be described, in a single phrase, as "growing sovereignty." The fiscal independence of Canada was officially recognized and proclaimed in the British House of Commons in 1879. In reply to a question of Mr. John Bright's on the Canadian protective tariff, the Secretary for the Colonies announced for the government that it deemed that "the fiscal policy of Canada rested, subject to treaty obligations, with the Dominion Parliament." The internal sovereignty of Canada has therefore been attained, both in substance and in form. And Sir John Macdonald has declared:

"I am, as far as this question goes, up to the handle a home-ruler. We will govern our own country. We will put on the taxes ourselves. If we choose to misgovern ourselves, we will do so, and we do not desire England, Ireland, or Scotland to tell us we are fools."

But, furthermore, even in foreign affairs Great Britain figures less as the suzerain of Canada than as a motherly helper and support. If she negotiates Canadian treaties, she does it in the way Canada desires. And of late, as in the Washington treaty and the recent fisheries convention, negotiations affecting Canada are conducted by the aid of a Canadian envoy. So that in reality, if not in name, Canada has external sovereignty also. But her status of even nominal pupillage cannot in the nature of things endure. A free people must realize the condition and end of freedom, which is their own autonomy. And, without breach or jar, Canada will continue in the line of her present development till she touches the goal of national destiny as a full-grown sovereign commonwealth.

That Canada is following this course of evolution, a glance at the political parties abundantly confirms. "Great men are the guide-posts and landmarks in the state." Sir John Macdonald has been the real ruler of the Dominion since its formation, excepting only the few years of Mr. Mackenzie's administration. His was the organizing spirit that framed the confederation. His enemies describe him as an astute politician, a skillful party leader, an adroit parliamentarian. History will record him a great statesman and rank him with the foremost. But these qualities alone could not have secured him for a score of years the government of Canada and the confidence and affection of the people. He has felt and responded to their aspirations for nationality. He has given them a national policy. And with their support he has accomplished a work of constructive statesmanship which is destined to leave the impress of his genius on the map of North America with a vividness inferior only to that of Washington, of Jefferson, and of Lincoln.

In spite of the undoubted ability and high character of its leaders, the Liberal

or "Grit" party of Canada, on the other hand, has failed, because it has not been responsive to the national aspirations of the people. It has been too much of a party of mere negations. It opposed the national tariff. It opposed the building of a national railway. It resisted the exercise by the federal government of its constitutional powers. It raised in Nova Scotia the banner of secession, till a vote of the people buried it forever. The curious political student will find a striking analogy in the conduct of the Federalists, of whom the historian of American politics writes:

"They dropped to the level of a mere party of opposition; they went further, until the only article of their political creed was State sovereignty; some of them went one step further, and dabbled in the hopeless projects for secession."

The Liberals, like the Federalists, helped to frame the Constitution. Their subsequent career has been so far identical. But they are now endeavoring to escape the nemesis which overtook the Federalists by a policy of freer trade between Canada and the United States. They began with commercial union—assimilation of tariffs, abolition of customs on the boundary, and pooling of revenues. But the Canadian people, jealous of their fiscal independence, protested against its surrender. Then the scheme was changed to a removal of duties by means of reciprocal legislation by the legislatures of the two countries. But this had always been the policy of the Conservative party, so far as natural products were concerned or so far as was consistent with protection to home industries. To mark the difference, the Grits, with fateful genius for negation, christened their policy "unrestricted reciprocity." But while in Canada commercial union has thus declined into a harmless flank attack upon the tariff, at Washington it has developed into a scheme of political union, which, undoubtedly, was its original recommendation to American politicians. The "continental" policy proves so checkered and contradictory that its supporters seem to agree in nothing save in finding themselves, like the famous cabinet of Lord Chatham, "they know not how, pigging together, heads and points, in the same truckle-bed." The Liberals, however, are opposed to annexation. Whether they have discovered a positive national policy is a question time only can decide.

RELATIONS WITH UNITED STATES.

Both parties in Canada desire an extension of trade relations with the States. But neither party wants it at the cost of political independence. Our social intercourse is of the freest; our commercial relations may be, and I hope will be, enlarged; but we do not desire a political partnership, either in your glory, or in your herculean task of settling the problems growing out of slavery, immigration, unrestricted suffrage, monopolies, and conflicts between social classes. You cannot, of course, cancel the *connubium*. But if you refuse the *commercium*, as Senator Blair and others advise, while we shall not criticise your consistent protectionism, we can, however, assure you that this will not force Canada into the Union. The vaulting ambition of politicians overleaps itself and falls on the other side. A policy of cunning is the parent of confusion only. The healing and cementing principle of nations is justice and kindness. Force, whether commercial or military, is as weak an instrument for uniting nations to-day as when Burke showed the folly of applying it to the thirteen Colonies.

At any rate, the only possible ground of ill feeling between us, the fisheries dispute, ought to admit of speedy settlement. It is a great injustice to suppose, as has been asserted, that under theegis of Great Britain Canada is disposed to annoy her great southern neighbor. It is more likely that the latter, mindful of the boundaries dispute, expects to gain something by delaying the settlement of the fisheries question. Both charges are probably untrue. At any rate, Canada is animated by the most neighborly spirit, and she has everything to lose by unfriendliness. Her forbearance is officially recognized in the last report of the Maine Commissioners of Fisheries and Game. But Canada deems she has certain rights, and Americans certain disqualifications, under the treaty of 1818, which gave her an advantage in the fishing industry. That instrument stipulated that American fishing vessels might enter our harbors for wood, water, shelter, and repairs, but for no other purpose whatsoever. Consequently, they are not allowed to buy provisions, bait, and supplies, or to tranship their fish. If this has been abrogated by subsequent reciprocal legislation or by the treaty of Washington, it should be easy to cite the canceling clauses. That they do not exist, and that Canada is only insisting on her rights, more than half of the citizens of the United States have acknowledged in giving to Mr. Cleveland a popular majority for the presidency. When the Republicans, under the responsibility of office, survey the whole situation, they will, I believe, follow the Democrats in recognizing the equity of the Canadian claims. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations solemnly assured the Senate, on the 7th of August last, that in the event of General Harrison's election, they "need not fear any war or any dangerous controversy out of the fisheries."

With the United States we earnestly desire friendship, intercourse, and unalloyed peace. It is a double anachronism for you to visit upon Canada the ancient sin of England. Americans are jealous of European influence on this continent. Yet their recent treatment of Canada has obliged her to lean strongly upon her European support. The sentiment of imperial federation has struck deep roots during the discussion of the fisheries question. Canada is the arbiter of her own destiny, and if she seeks it in federation, the Monroe Doctrine (which in any case is not the law of nations) could not be adapted to the coercion of a free people in the final settlement of their own government.

POLITICAL DESTINY.

Is Canada likely to choose imperial federation? That term covers two meanings. It may stand for a federated state (*Bundesstaat*), or for a federation of states (*Staatenbund*). The American union, whatever the original intention (and it was very different according to Jefferson), has become, as everybody recognizes since the Civil War, a republic of the former character, though the equality of State representation in the Senate survives as an element of the other system. When imperial federation is talked about in Canada, it naturally suggests the American pattern. But to that neither Canadians nor Englishmen could agree. Not Canadians; for it would deprive them of their fiscal independence, and without conceivable advantage to countervail, it would entail partnership in European, African, and Asiatic wars for interests not directly or even remotely related to their own. And not Englishmen; for proportionate representation in parliament (to say nothing of equal representation in the upper House) would mean the ultimate absorption of England by Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the rest. England is now the stable centre of her empire. Nay, it is *her* empire. But this scheme of imperial federation would change all that. It would loosen England from her moorings, and send her, the prey of constant diminution, to drift in an aimless circuit of the globe she now girdles with her flag.

There remains the scheme of a league or federation of states. But Canada could enter this only as an equal sovereign commonwealth. The object of the federation might be defence, or any other specified purpose. Examples are found in the Germanic Confederation before 1866, the Hanseatic League in medieval Germany, and the Swiss Confederation up to the present century. Imperial federation, for the British Empire, might mean merely an advisory council of sovereign states. But whatever form it took, it would imply nationality in severalty. It can, therefore, scarcely be of this scheme that Sir John Macdonald says, "Imperial federation is utterly impracticable." Such a union would be almost as practicable as the present alliance between Germany, Austria, and Italy. It might even be extended to include all the English-speaking nations of the globe. It would gradually lead up to that court of envoys which, according to some writers, is the great desideratum for the sovereign states of Christendom. Thus, imperial federation, in its only feasible sense, would, in readjusting the relations of Great Britain to her colonies, prepare the way for "the parliament of man, the federation of the world."

But however these things be, and whether the ultimate destiny of Canada is to be an isolated or an allied state, the first preliminary qualifying for either is that she shall move on without jar in her present career of growing sovereignty. It is necessary that she shall know the value and feel the responsibility of complete autonomy, as she now enjoys its privileges. Both individuals and communities grow to the burdens they bear. And Canada is no exception to the rule. But there must be no break with the past. And the process has already gone so far that there will be little difference from the present. Her position toward Great Britain will be scarcely changed from what it is to-day. But between the English-speaking family of nations in the Old World and in the New, Canada will be no longer a dubious promise, but an outspoken pledge of peace, amity, and fraternity.

A Personal Investigation

Of the Results of Prohibition in Kansas by a New York Observer Man.

That stalwart Conservative journal, the *New York Observer*, a few weeks ago sent a member of its editorial staff through Kansas on a tour of investigation concerning the efficacy and the results of Prohibition. On his way homeward he held a conference in Pittsburgh with the officers in charge of the amendment campaign, giving a full statement of the results of his observations. His statements are reported in the *Pittsburgh Times* as follows:

"All the statements I have to make on the subject of Prohibition in Kansas are based on facts and figures which are within my own personal knowledge. It is not hearsay evidence I have to offer or baseless rumor. I am ready to prove every statement that I shall make. I went out to Kansas to make a personal investigation of the working of the prohibitory law. I was commissioned to find out the truth in regard to the matter, the bottom facts, no matter on which side the balance might fall. In pursuance of my object I visited eleven of the larger cities of Kansas, including Wyandotte, Fort Scott, Wichita, Topeka, Leavenworth and Atchison and a number of smaller towns. I had personal interviews with between 300 and 400 persons, including people of all ranks and conditions, from the Governor of the State down to the bootblacks on the streets. I purposely sought out the leading opponents of the law, that I might learn all the arguments on that side. I visited the jails, the poor-houses, the police courts and every other place where I thought I could obtain any facts or figures having a bearing on Prohibition. I made particular inquiries as to the effect of the law upon crime and pauperism, upon business and upon public morals, and I was able to collect a volume of evidence on all the points. And now I am prepared to state and prove that Prohibition has been a success in Kansas, as much as any other law against crime."

Governor Humphrey, the succeeding Governor of Kansas, in his first annual message, says:

"The growth of public sentiment in support of constitutional Prohibition in Kansas is steady, healthy and unmistakable. In the last campaign no political party had the temerity to demand a re-submission of the question to the people, in the face of a popular verdict that has been repeated and emphasized every time the popular sense has been taken. As an issue in Kansas politics, re-submission is as dead as slavery."