

public life, but it has also by a grave historian been declared that Great Britain has steadily aimed throughout her whole history to make morality the basis of her political activity. "From our point of view," writes Mr. Gardiner, of England, "the extension of our rule is a benefit to the world, and subject races have gained far more than they have lost by submission to a just and beneficent administration, whilst our counsels have always, or almost always, been given with a view to free the oppressed and to put a bridle in the mouth of the oppressor. . . . We are prone without afterthought to place our strength at the service of morality, and even to feel unhappy, if we cannot convince ourselves that the progress of the human race is forwarded by our action." According to the judgment of Mr. Gardiner, the rule of Great Britain throughout all her history has been mainly a benefit to the world; it has been just and beneficent; it has made steadily for a high morality; it has helped forward the human race. The French writer already quoted has remarked "To hold up his head, that is an Englishmen's first need." At the beginning of the present century it was thought that a great man, such as Napoleon, was chosen by destiny to carry out the decrees of nature, and stood above the moral law. His greatness was thought to be separable from his goodness. Men were, it was said, to look upon the work of such a man as upon a force of nature, whose operations it would be absurd either to praise or blame. But England refuses to let slip the moral standard. While it is admitted that high statesmanship must consider and make room for all the factors which enter into the problem, it is also felt that the statesman fails if amidst all the turmoil of circumstances he does not adopt a line of action which is consistent with the dictates of a broad morality.

3. A third noteworthy feature of the patriotism of this year is the generous recognition by the imperial powers of the value of closer union with the scattered colonies and dependencies. If *L'Esprit de solidarite dans le mal*, the spirit of solidarity in evil, is peculiarly dangerous, because of the support which each member receives from and lends to the rest, the spirit of solidarity in good must be equally advantageous because the enthusiasm of each is heightened and intensified by becoming the enthusiasm of all. Lofty more than low ideals are contagious. When a large number of men are actuated by a high aim, it often prevents the unworthy act from being even so much as conceived. The banding together in London last June of men from almost every clime and zone, of almost every creed and colour, was at least a prophecy of the unity of mankind. Yet, distinct as was the recognition by

all of the advantages of union, there was present likewise a determination on the part of the Imperial authorities, as well as on the part of the colonies and dependencies, that no union could be entertained which meant the sacrifice by any member of its individuality. If solidarity meant the fusing together of the colonies and the mother-land into one uniform people, the obliteration of all the elements which go to make each colony a distinct factor of the common weal, if solidarity meant a solidification of the British Empire, then it was neither feasible nor desirable. In Canada we have been long familiar with the idea that union not only becomes more secure, but is of a higher kind, when it accepts and rises above differences of race and creed. When Father Kelly, of our own city, pointing on Jubilee day to the flag floating over the sacred edifice, said to the Roman Catholic school children that there was no antagonism between it and the cross, he meant that differences in creed and religious observance were quite compatible with a common patriotism. When creeds are seen not to stand in the way of loyalty, the religious life of our country is all the richer and fuller for the diversity. By it we are vividly reminded that it is the good pleasure of the Supreme Being to reveal Himself in divers ways to divers persons, and that to Him all roads lead, over which travels the pure heart. Not only have we in Canada learned that differences in religious convictions hinder neither the true worship of God nor devotion to the flag, but differences in race and language are likewise seen to be no insuperable barrier to political unity. At the time of the confederation of the Provinces of British North America it was already understood by keen-sighted statesmen that the very proposal to federate the provinces was a triumph of patriotism over racial prejudice. "And well," said the Hon. George Brown, "might our present attitude in Canada arrest the attention of other countries. Here is a people composed of two distinct races, speaking different languages, with religious and social and municipal and educational institutions totally different; with sectional hostilities of such a character as to render government for many years well-nigh impossible; with a constitution so unjust in the view of one section as to justify any resort to enforce a remedy. And yet, sir, here we sit patiently and temperately discussing how these great evils and hostilities may justly and amicably be swept away forever." "One hundred years," he continued, "have passed away since the conquest of Quebec, but here sit the children of the victor and the vanquished, all avowing hearty attachment to the British crown—all earnestly deliberating how we shall best extend the blessing of British institu-